

SEP 1 4 1909



# THE MONTH

## A CATHOLIC MAGAZINE



NO. 543 (NEW SERIES 153) SEPT., 1909

### CONTENTS

THE EUCHARISTIC CONGRESS AT COLOGNE.	
	<i>By A. Hilliard Atteridge</i> 225
THE CLERGY AND SOCIAL WORK. I.....	<i>By P.</i> 235
IMPRESSIONS OF FATHER GERARD HOPKINS, S.J. III.	
	<i>By the Rev. Joseph Keating</i> 246
"THE PROBLEM OF EVOLUTION".....	<i>By the Editor</i> 259
MANDEVILLE'S TRAVELS.....	<i>By Harold Binns</i> 266
A SECOND-HAND MISSION.....	<i>By Alice Dease</i> 276
THE THEORY OF UNEARNED INCREMENT.	
	<i>By the Rev. Sydney F. Smith</i> 282
A LIBEL ON MEDIAEVAL MISSIONS.....	<i>By the Rev. Herbert Thurston</i> 292
FLOTSAM AND JETSAM.....	307
Queen Elizabeth and the Mass.	
A bogus Protestant Martyr.	
The Ethics of Falsification.	
Traduttore Traditore.	
REVIEWS.....	318
SHORT NOTICES.....	332
BOOKS RECEIVED.....	335
SOME FOREIGN REVIEWS.....	336

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO  
LONDON & ONE SHILLING

# STONYHURST PHILOSOPHICAL SERIES.

---

## PSYCHOLOGY:

Empirical and Rational.

BY

MICHAEL MAHER, S.J., D.Lit.; M.A. LOND.

SIXTH EDITION.

(SEVENTEENTH TO NINETEENTH THOUSAND.)

PRICE 6s. 6d.

---

1. **Logic.** By RICHARD F. CLARKE, S.J., formerly Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, Oxford. Second Edition. Price 5s.
  2. **First Principles of Knowledge.** By JOHN RICKABY, S.J., late Professor of Logic and General Metaphysics at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. Fourth Edition. Price 5s.
  3. **Moral Philosophy (Ethics and Natural Law).** By JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J., M.A. Lond.; late Professor of Ethics at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. Third Edition. Price 5s.
  4. **Natural Theology.** By BERNARD BOEDDER, S.J., Professor of Natural Theology at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. Second Edition. Price 6s. 6d.
  6. **General Metaphysics.** By JOHN RICKABY, S.J. Second Edition. Price 5s.
  7. **Political Economy.** By CHARLES S. DEVAS, M.A. Oxon. Sometime Examiner in Political Economy at the Royal University of Ireland. Third Edition. Revised and Enlarged. (Seventh to Ninth Thousand). Price 7s. 6d.
- 

LONGMANS, GREEN, & Co., London, New York, Bombay, and Calcutta.







## *The Eucharistic Congress at Cologne.*

---

THE Twentieth Eucharistic Congress, held in the first week of August at Cologne, has been almost unnoticed by the English press. To many this silence of our daily papers on the subject has been a surprise, and something of a disappointment. Nearly a hundred non-Catholic papers dealt with the London Congress of last year in considerable detail, treating it in a respectful and almost a sympathetic spirit. After this many Catholics expected that something like adequate notice would be taken of the great gathering at Cologne. But for any one who has an inside knowledge of the English press there was nothing surprising in its neglect of the Cologne Congress.

The September Congress of 1908 forced itself upon the attention of the non-Catholic press. Even small events in London fill a large space in the mental perspective of the British journalist; and the Congress was obviously a big London event, even from the most matter-of-fact standpoint, and although its objects and its spirit were alike difficult for the average editor to understand. The organizing Committee did something to remove the obstacle created by ignorance of Catholic ideals by sending an excellent guide to the Congress to every newspaper office some weeks before it assembled, and by supplying the press with abundant preliminary information. During the days of the Congress special facilities were given to the representatives of the press. The mere fact that a Papal Legate made his appearance in London for the first time for centuries made it something of a sensational event. Curiosity and interest were excited. Every day the papers gave a larger space to the proceedings of the Congress, and the crisis that arose over the procession aroused the attention of even the most indifferent.

But the Cologne Congress was something outside the usual scope of the average English newspaper. There is a popular delusion that the Argus-eyed London editor "surveys mankind from China to Peru," and that nothing important escapes his

attention. But a long experience as a journalist has convinced me that this world-survey is very incomplete and inadequate. This is partly the result of the fact that newspapers do not record the normal progress of events, but attend chiefly to the sensational and the abnormal. No great space is given to the affairs of any Continental country unless when a crisis occurs that threatens internal strife or foreign war. And Catholic action in foreign countries passes almost unnoticed, because as a rule its character is peaceful, and further because the correspondents who supply news to the London press are usually more in touch with non-Catholic and anti-Catholic politicians abroad than with the Catholic leaders. Some of them, too, are strangely ignorant of the most elementary Catholic ideas.

I had a curious illustration of this a few years ago. On the Sunday within the octave of Corpus Christi, the day on which the feast is kept in some Continental countries, I was taking a motor drive with a journalist who was the representative of a great news agency in a European capital. On his information some hundreds of English newspapers depended for such scanty reports as they published on Catholic action in that country. As we approached a village we saw that the road was strewn with leaves; then we heard the singing of a hymn, and between the double row of poplars in front of us appeared a village procession—Children of Mary, acolytes, and the priest carrying the monstrance under a canopy borne by four peasants. The car was stopped beside the road; I knelt; the chauffeur took off his cap and bent reverently over his wheel, while my friend stared in obvious surprise. When the procession had passed he turned to me and asked, "What was the priest carrying? Was it a reliquary?"

This was perhaps a case of exceptional ignorance. But my friend was a foreign journalist of European reputation. If he did not recognize a Corpus Christi procession when he saw it, what wonder that others of the same profession can make nothing of a Eucharistic Congress! The fact is that in a greater or lesser degree most of the foreign correspondents of the English press are strangely out of touch with all things Catholic. They have told us next to nothing of the rally of resistance to the persecuting laws in France. They hardly mention the great annual assemblies organized by the Catholic leaders in Germany, though the Centre is now the most powerful political force in the German Empire. And if they take scant notice of

Catholic Congresses convened to discuss politics, what wonder if they pass over in silence a religious Congress of which the motives and the methods are alike a mystery to them?

The last thing that the non-Catholic journalist takes account of is the supernatural. Christian charity he recognizes as a form of benevolent social activity. Work for the conversion of the heathen he has been familiarized with by the annual May meetings of the Protestant missionary societies. A Congress dealing with social reform or missionary enterprise would therefore be intelligible to him, but a Congress whose first end is acts of worship is quite outside his range of ideas.

Even in Germany the Cologne Congress was an enigma to the non-Catholic press. There was a remarkable illustration of this in the line taken by the *Koelnische Zeitung* (Cologne Gazette), a Liberal organ, supported by the money of some of the local Jewish community. On the eve of the Congress it published an article in which it tried to show that the coming Catholic gathering was a mere political demonstration, organized by the Centre party to show its strength. The editor, no doubt, wrote what he believed, but how far he was from the plain fact, was shown by the attitude of the other Cologne daily paper. The *Koelnische Zeitung* is frequently quoted by the English press, which hardly ever mentions its rival, a far more important journal, with at least three times as much circulation and influence. This is the *Koelnische Volkszeitung* (Cologne People's-Gazette), the chief Catholic organ in the German press, and one of the most important papers in Europe. It issues three editions daily—morning, noon, and evening—the mid-day edition being largely devoted to trade and business reports. It also issues special literary and scientific supplements, and a weekly supplement dealing with land and agricultural interests. Journalists and business men will understand its importance, when I mention that the editorial department alone has five telephones. On the Monday before the Papal Legate arrived, the *Koelnische Volkszeitung* devoted a leading article to a difference of opinion on questions of policy, that has arisen in the Centre party. But the writer apologized for even alluding to politics at such a time, and promised that during the Congress week not one word more should be said on the subject.

This was typical of the whole mental attitude of those who organized and directed the proceedings. An almost excessive care was taken to avoid even an allusion to mere political

questions. From first to last, thought, word, and deed, were kept on the higher plane of faith and devotion. In a German city—the typical German city—it was morally impossible for individual orators to avoid an occasional reference to the glories of the Hohenzollern Empire, but though the German members of the Congress were an overwhelming majority, and though their patriotism is only second to their faith, they never lost sight of the fact that it was essentially an international gathering; and a special effort seemed to be made to impress on the French visitors that there was no thought of old rivalries, and that they were doubly welcome because there had been strife between Frenchmen and Germans in the near past.

At the London Congress we met in the midst of an immense Protestant capital. Whether we wished it or not, there could not fail to be something almost aggressive in our demonstrations of loyalty to the representative of the Holy See, and in our gathering in the streets and round the Cathedral of Westminster on the Sunday when the procession of the Blessed Sacrament had been forbidden, and we held instead a procession of protest against the arbitrary action of the Government. But at the Cologne Congress we met in a great Catholic city, with an unbroken tradition of faith, extending over more than fifteen hundred years. Everywhere there was a Catholic atmosphere. There was no shadow of opposition. It seemed a natural thing to be engaged in public acts of devotion. The result was, that things were taken more as a matter of course than in London. Some of the English visitors even thought at first that there was a lack of enthusiasm. But the fact was, that the German Catholics found in the Eucharistic Congress only an intensification of their normal life of religious earnestness. Some of us who went to the early week-day Masses at five or six o'clock, and saw working men and women coming in and going to Holy Communion, thought at first that a special effort was being made because it was "Congress time." But German friends told us we might see the same edifying sight any week in the year.

There were indeed striking displays of enthusiasm, but the attitude of our German brethren was in the main one of quiet earnestness, that suggested a deep-seated, habitual spirit of faith and worship. I was greatly impressed by the welcome given to the Papal Legate by every Rhineland town and village as he passed down the river from Mainz to Cologne, but I was still more struck by the bearing of the enormous crowds that

lined the streets on the day of the procession. One felt that the vast majority had come not to gaze at a pageant, but to worship our Lord as He passed through street and boulevard and square. The recollection of the London procession, when the Legate was cheered by the tens of thousands, made it all the more striking to see those hundreds of thousands waiting hour after hour in silence, broken only by hymns and prayers, and bending forward in hushed adoration as the canopy went by.

Our Catholic newspapers have so fully reported the proceedings of the Congress that there is no need to attempt another record here. I shall instead note some of the impressions of those memorable days, and some of the thoughts they suggest. To many of my English-speaking friends, who were visiting the Rhineland for the first time, the scenes of the Legate's progress down the river came as a surprise. Even I, who have often visited Germany, was not prepared for the intensity of popular feeling that was displayed. Most people have deep in their minds the old traditional idea that Germany is a Protestant country—the "land of Luther." They forget that many of the states and provinces which make up the German Empire of to-day have a population that is mainly Catholic, and that there are wide districts that are as Catholic as Connaught or Brittany. The Rhine Province is one of the Catholic regions, and never had Papal Legate a more enthusiastically loyal welcome than the Rhinelanders gave to Cardinal Vincenzo Vannutelli. Those who witnessed it will never forget that scene on August 3rd, when the flotilla of white steamers made its triumphal progress down the river, led by the Legate's ship, with the Papal colours flying at the bow, the flags of the Federal States of Germany fluttering from a forest of flagstuffs above the awning, and the Black Eagle standard at the stern; while every town and village rang its church bells, fired loud salutes of cannon and mortars, and greeted the envoy of Pius X. with the cheers of its people. It was no empty pageantry seeking to revive a vanished past, but a picturesque reality of the living present, a memory that will live in the history of the German people.

This at the very outset impressed us with the fact that we were in a Catholic land. Let me admit that the actual arrival at Cologne was somewhat disappointing. It was something of an anti-climax. The proceedings were rather stiff and formal. The people were tired with waiting, for the arrival of the

Legate was long after the hour fixed in the programme. His reception was correct and respectful and not without elements of the picturesque, but the wharf and the narrow street opening on it were not the place for a great display, and in the city crowd there was not the simple enthusiasm of the riverside populations. But probably I should have been more impressed if I had not seen that wonderful prelude to the meeting of the Cardinal Legate and the Cardinal Archbishop of Cologne under the triumphal arch by the riverside.

Again there was for many something disappointing in the first general assembly of the Congress held in the Cathedral on the Wednesday afternoon. Material conditions made it more difficult to arrange than the general meetings in London. We were fortunate in having the Albert Hall where an audience of many thousands could be arranged, circle above circle, in that vast amphitheatre, all in sight of the platform and within earshot of a practised speaker. But Cologne has no public hall of the kind, and the nave of the Cathedral was arranged for the general meetings. Very wisely the architect who was entrusted with the work, had refrained from concealing the beautiful lines of the magnificent building with improvised decorations. Tall evergreen shrubs were grouped round the pillars, barriers covered with red cloth were erected, and a pulpit with a large sounding-board placed about half-way down the nave. This was all. Chairs for the Cardinals and prelates were placed near the pulpit, but most of the audience had to stand. They overflowed into the double aisles and the transepts. There must have been at least twelve thousand people present. Such a gathering in such a place could not fail to be impressive. But then came the inevitable drawback, the sense of disappointment for many. At least half the great audience was simply present at the meeting, without being able to take part in it. Many could not even see what was going on. They stood amid the forest of giant pillars in the midst of a great crowd, and heard the confused echoing of a far-off voice. Only those in the middle of the nave itself could really follow the speeches. The Blessed Sacrament was reserved in a side-chapel, and there some hundreds of priests and laymen gathered and quietly said their Office or their Rosary.

But for those who were fortunate enough to hear the speeches there was no disappointment. Latin, German, and French speakers successively occupied the improvised pulpit. The

Cardinal Archbishop of Cologne spoke in all three languages, to his polyglot audience. Cardinal Vannutelli, in his opening speech, referred to the Catholic traditions of Cologne, and claimed that it was there St. Thomas wrote the hymns still sung at every Benediction. He thanked the German people for their welcome and paid a tribute to the Kaiser's policy of giving the fullest freedom to the Church in the Empire. Then Cardinal Fischer, after he had made a graceful reply in Latin to the Cardinal Legate, and spoken words of encouragement to the Germans of his audience in their native language, addressed the foreign Catholic visitors "in the language most widely known among them, the language of their French brethren whose presence in such numbers in Cologne was a joy to every Catholic German heart." Here they all met as sons of the one Father in Heaven, sons of the Universal Church that knew nothing of frontiers, because it was Catholic, brothers in heart and soul united to honour the Holy Eucharist which was their one Heavenly Food. Then came the Mayor of Cologne, wearing his gold chain of office, and speaking in the name of the city, no cold formal speech, but glowing words of rejoicing that Cologne should be chosen to be for a while the place where the King of Kings held his Court, and ending with a prayer that God's Holy Spirit might be with them—increasing their faith and love for the Holy Eucharist, uniting them all in a common joy in God's presence, and making those days in Cologne a happy memory for the rest of their lives.

Nor was he the only layman who spoke in this eloquence of living faith to that audience of Cardinals and prelates, priests and laymen. One understood something of the vigour of Catholic life in Germany as one listened to a distinguished lawyer, Dr. Marx of Düsseldorf, addressing the men who were present, insisting that if they were to be good citizens they must first be earnest Catholics, drawing their strength from the altar; and urging them to lose no opportunity of publicly honouring our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament. He called on every layman present to regard it as the highest honour to be allowed to take part in any public manifestation of devotion to the Holy Eucharist; to let no insult to the great Mystery of our faith pass without protest; to show the reality of faith in the acts of daily life. "Let us be men," he said, "true, brave-hearted Catholic men! Let us show true strength of character in this age of weak characters and of lack of all character!



Let us ever remember the day when the Bishop's hand signed our foreheads with the cross, as he bade us be soldiers of Christ! Let us proclaim with heart and lips, with firm, unflinching faith, steadfast hope and burning love, that watchword of our religion—'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God!'"

These were no empty words. Surely it is because this spirit lives in so many German laymen that Pius X. was able to say to Cardinal Vannutelli, "The Catholics of Germany are not only my soldiers—they are my soldiers of the Guard." There was evidence of the same vigorous Catholic life in the German sectional meetings, at the Masses and services in churches, and finally in the great procession.

There were separate sectional meetings in eight different languages, Latin, German, Italian, English, French, Dutch, Spanish, and Polish. I paid visits to many of these meetings. In the French section the point to which speaker after speaker referred, the idea that was in every mind, was summed up by the Archbishop of Paris when he spoke of the days when prayers were offered in France for the persecuted Catholics of Germany, and reminded his hearers that in those times of persecution was sown the seed of to-day's splendid harvest. "The same seed is now being sown in France," he said. "Let us act like our German brethren, and we shall see the same harvest." And there was more than one proof that the Catholic manhood of France is at last rallying round its altars. The Kaiser's message of welcome to the Papal Legate, his wishes for the success of the Congress, accentuated the contrast between the position of the Church in Germany and in France, but it is not so many years since Kaiser William I. came to Cologne to see the newly-completed Cathedral, and its Archbishop was in prison. If French Catholics will but follow the example of the manly faith and united action of their German brethren, the chief ruler of France may before many years be sending words of welcome to another Eucharistic Congress.

The English-speaking Catholics mustered strongly. Many a Catholic gathering here at home has been less largely attended than the sectional meetings in the "White Hall" of the Cologne Catholic Club, and the Benedictions at St. Ursula's. It was pleasant to hear the numerous references made by the Legate, the Archbishop of Cologne, and others to the impulse given to the Eucharistic Congress movement by last year's gathering in London. The papers read at the English-speaking sectional



meetings were of a high order of merit and interest. In more than one of the discussions that followed them, the speakers bore testimony to the lasting fruits of the London Congress. And at this moment, when persistent efforts are being made to create ill-will between England and Germany, the Archbishop of Westminster's words at St. Ursula's were a welcome message of peace. He spoke of the historic links between England and Germany, of the tomb of the Saxon Boniface at Fulda to this day the centre of German Catholicity, and then, in words that went to every heart, protested that these two nations, bound together in a long past, kindred in race and language, should surely live in peace and brotherhood, and prayed that this union of English and German Catholics in a solemn act of worship of the God of peace might tend to draw both peoples together in the bond of charity.

The Congress was brought to a fitting close by the celebrations of the Sunday. Hundreds of thousands crowded into Cologne. The British Consul said that he believed the population of the city had been temporarily doubled and for a few hours was near a million. And the remarkable thing was that it was no mere throng of holiday-makers drawn together by a picturesque spectacle. The thousands who came to the Rhineland capital, some of them from the far-off Russian frontiers, were pilgrims not excursionists. They brought the banners of their churches. They came to pray and worship. For long hours in the early morning Masses and Communions went on unceasingly in the churches. Then in the afternoon the streets of Cologne were like the aisles of some immense sanctuary. The demeanour alike of processionists and spectators was beyond all praise, and what struck one most in the procession was not the long array of clergy and prelates, but the tens of thousands of men marching in the ranks of the Catholic societies. They came chiefly from the Rhineland and that great hive of prosperous industry, the coal and iron district of Westphalia, but every part of Germany had its representatives. They were not working men only, for there was at least one guild of merchants and business men, but they were chiefly societies of workmen—those characteristically German combinations of trades union, social club and religious confraternity, which the Catholics have organized throughout the Empire. Here they were acting in their religious capacity, and the earnest devotion of all of them was worthy of the occasion.

The final scene of the Benediction at the temporary altar erected on the steps of the Cathedral and backed by the enormous spires was the fitting culmination of a never-to-be-forgotten day. But even then the people were not satisfied and crowds poured into the churches to kneel in prayer before the Blessed Sacrament.

One realized that there was no mere theatrical display, but that for very many there had come with the closing of the Congress a deepening of their spiritual life. The Hand of God is surely here. The Eucharistic Congress movement began twenty years ago with a small gathering of French and Belgian Catholics. For a while it was almost limited to the French-speaking peoples. Each Congress showed an increase in numbers and in zeal. The movement became international, and prepared the way for the action of Pius X. in setting at rest a long controversy and making frequent and even daily Communion not the privilege of a few chosen souls, but the right of all who are living a Catholic life. The Congresses seem to be the occasion of a new impulse to devotion to the Sacrament of the Altar, and to the practical life of Faith. We see nation after nation claiming the privilege of welcoming the annual Congress, and, to use the words of the Mayor of Cologne, "making one of its cities the court of the King of Kings." Next year the Congress meets in Canada. In 1911 it will be in Spain, in 1912 in Austria.

In more than twenty years it will thus have had only one meeting in our own islands. In France there has for the last few years been an annual meeting of a national Eucharistic Congress, and I know that at the Cologne Congress, many priests and laymen expressed a wish that we could have a Eucharistic Congress each year in the United Kingdom. It might, perhaps, be held about the date of the feast of Corpus Christi, in some Catholic centre in Great Britain or Ireland. Dublin, with its numerous churches, and its easy means of access from all parts of our islands, would be an ideal centre in which to make a beginning. Such a Congress here at home would carry on the work begun amongst us at the great gathering of last year, and would be a welcome rallying centre for the many who cannot hope to travel to such distant places of meeting as Montreal or Vienna. The local Congresses in France have proved a most useful auxiliary to the great international Congresses, and doubtless there would be the same results from such a development amongst ourselves.

A. H. A.

## *The Clergy and Social Work.*

---

### I.

SHOULD the clergy take part in social and economic movements? The question has been hotly disputed upon the Continent of recent years: disputed, that is to say, among the clergy themselves, for we are not here concerned with objections against "clerical interference" brought by those whose instinct is to hit the biretta wherever they see it.

On the one hand it has been argued that the study of economic questions, the establishment of sanitary dwellings and cottage gardens, labour bureaux and Raiffeisen banks, co-operative and benefit societies, form no part of a priest's sacerdotal duties. Even were the clergy able to find time for such matters, their time, it is held, would be better spent in extending and intensifying their purely spiritual activities.

On the other hand it is urged that, although not all priests are called upon to take a direct and personal share in social and economic enterprises, yet it is eminently desirable that a large number of them should do so; and this for reasons which shall be set forth presently.

These discussions among the clergy have gradually resulted in a certain measure of substantial agreement. On the one side the advocates of social work among the clergy have made it clear that they are under no misapprehension as to what are the primary and essential duties of the priest, and that their aim is to exalt and safeguard rather than to depreciate his supernatural functions. They have dissociated themselves markedly and entirely from certain perverse and uncatholic views which have drawn down the condemnation of Rome. Père Antoine has recently, in the columns of a well-known French Review, made it clear that Catholic social work when conducted upon sound lines, far from laying itself open to the charge of Modernism, is essentially opposed to Modernism in its principles and spirit.

On the other side, those who formerly advocated the policy of abstention have been brought to acknowledge that some degree of social activity among the clergy is rendered imperatively necessary by the circumstances of our time. And if any doubt remained on the matter it has been removed by the voice of authority. The Holy See has explicitly encouraged social activity on the part of the clergy, and a large and increasing number of Bishops now advocate it in the clearest and most distinct terms.

It is the purpose of the present article to consider some of the reasons which have been urged in favour of social work for the clergy. A subsequent article will describe some of the forms which that work has taken of recent years on the Continent.

Why, then, should a priest concern himself with social and economic questions? The reasons have been well set forth by Père H. J. Leroy, the pioneer of that very striking movement, *l'Action Populaire*, of which some account has been given in a recent number of *THE MONTH*. In his pamphlet, *Le Clergé et les œuvres sociales*, he points out that the priest is called upon to interest himself in such questions, first because he has received an authoritative mandate to do so from his ecclesiastical superiors; secondly, because modern circumstances demand it as a condition of exercising his spiritual functions efficiently; and thirdly, because Christian charity requires it. These reasons may be considered in order, though we need not adhere strictly to Père Leroy's arguments.

(i.)

The Holy See, while condemning certain exaggerated and even false social theories which have from time to time been advanced by individuals or small groups among the clergy, has given the warmest encouragement to priests who have undertaken social work on sound Catholic lines, and has exhorted others to follow their example, at the same time stating the reasons which make such initiative on the part of the clergy particularly desirable at the present day.

All will remember how, in the Encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, Leo XIII., after giving a vividly realistic description of the evils of the modern capitalistic system, and sketching the dislocation of society in which it has resulted, goes on to prescribe

the remedies for what has become an intolerable state of things. Christian morality must be reinstated, justice and charity made effectual realities, property brought within the reach of the proletariat, a living wage insisted upon, Sunday rest secured, and industrial conflicts prevented. And special stress is laid upon the need of association.

The Pope makes it perfectly clear that the Catholic Church has an important part to play in this great work of reformation. The Church must not merely set forth her principles. She must translate them into practice. Her duty in the matter does not end with the declaration that the injustice is to be removed. She must labour to remove it. She cannot leave the solution of the problem entirely to the civil authorities. She must co-operate with those authorities in the effort to solve it.

It is clear that a work in which all Catholics are called upon by the Holy See to take part must be a matter of special concern to the clergy. Though lay co-operation is essential, priests have their peculiar obligations in the matter by reason of their position and personal influence. And so we are not surprised to find the Holy See laying particular stress upon those obligations and praising the efforts of priests who in various ways have taken the initiative in social enterprise. Documents to this effect abound, but it will be enough to quote a few sentences from the Encyclical Letter of Pope Pius X. addressed to the Italian Bishops in 1905 :

By an effectual propaganda of writings, by stirring oral exhortations and by direct aid let him [the priest] strive to ameliorate, within the limits of justice and charity, the economic condition of the people, favouring and furthering those institutions which tend in that direction. . . . In this way the help of the clergy in works of Catholic action aims at a highly religious object and will never be a hindrance, but will even be of assistance to the spiritual ministry, enlarging its sphere and multiplying its fruit. . . . The social question deserves to have all the Catholic forces applied to it with the greatest energy and constancy. . . . Take thoroughly to heart the interests of the people, and particularly of the working and agricultural classes, not only instilling into the minds of all the religious principle, the only true fountain of consolation in the troubles of life, but endeavouring to wipe away their tears, to assuage their sorrows, to improve their economic condition by well-adapted measures. . . . These good works should correspond fully to the wants of society to-day and be well adapted to the moral and material interests of the people.

The exhortations of Leo XIII. and Pius X. have been echoed by Bishops in every part of the world. Here our documents are simply overwhelming, and the temptation to multiply quotations demands severe self-restraint. It is clearly impossible to convey in a few short extracts the impression created by the vigorous and weighty pronouncements of scores of Bishops. Yet some effort must be made to indicate the very definite trend of episcopal feeling in the matter, since it will furnish us with an answer to those who may still maintain that the Church does not encourage her ministers to co-operate in social reforms. At the same time we shall gain fresh motives for confidence in the power of the Church to heal the wounds of society, and a deeper insight into the mind of the Church as regards the weightiest problems of the present day.

We may take for granted the attitude of the German episcopacy in the matter. Suffice to say that the priests of Germany, who are pioneers in social work, have the very warmest approbation and encouragement of their ecclesiastical superiors, and that their splendid initiative may be traced to the impulse given to social work among the clergy by Bishop Ketteler.<sup>1</sup>

It will be more interesting to quote some of the exhortations of the Bishops in countries where until recently the clergy have not as a rule been noted for their direct co-operation in social reform.

The Bishop of Bergamo has written as follows :

Society has manifest need of authority, of liberty, of justice, of charity, of the Gospel, of Jesus Christ, since it is Christ who must re-establish all things. But neither authority, nor liberty, nor justice, nor charity, nor the Gospel, nor Jesus Christ will be given us save by the priest and with the priest. This is no question of secondary importance for society ; it is a question of life or death.

Hence there clearly arises the duty of the priest to take his place in the modern social movement, and to occupy it with dignity and prudence. To ask whether the priest can occupy himself with all that concerns the very life of society and especially of the bulk of the people, of this Christian democracy, is to ask whether the priest ought to be a priest. His duty, his purpose, his mission is to devote himself entirely to the good of souls in every phase of human life,—the individual, the family, the school, law, government, social class, society.

<sup>1</sup> For a sketch of Bishop Ketteler's life and an account of the attitude of the German hierarchy, see *Catholic Social Work in Germany*, a shilling volume shortly to be published by Messrs. Sands and Co., with a Preface by the Bishop of Salford.

He ought to be, with his divine Master and like that Master, the saviour of each and all, even to suffering and to death. This matter I believe to be entirely beyond dispute, especially after what the Pope has said and done.

The views of the French Bishops may be found set forth in a bulky pamphlet published by *l'Action Populaire* in the series *Actes sociaux*. Some suggestive references and quotations are also given in the *Guide Social* for 1907. As a specimen we may quote some words written by the Bishop of Périgueux, Mgr. Delamaire, to *La Croix* (August, 1906). The Bishop points out that it is the special duty of the priest to create the atmosphere necessary for successful social reform by diffusing among the people sentiments of justice, unselfishness, devotion to the common good, and consideration for the weak. He then continues :

The priest should not dream of exercising this great and noble function without personal effort and suitable preparation. If he wishes to influence the masses he must, without neglecting the essential duties of his sacred ministry, namely the sanctification and salvation of souls, learn how to present the Gospel and Christianity under aspects which have relation to social life, the temporal welfare of the individual, and civil and political utility. He must accustom himself, when giving instruction of this kind, to exhibit religion to his auditors, according to their age and degree of education, as exercising a perpetual and very real influence upon the welfare of individuals and societies.

He must convince the young in schools and societies, and the faithful who listen to him in church and elsewhere, that religion leads not only to Heaven, but also, by the practice of Christian duties, to prosperity and happiness in the present life.

After reproaching certain Catholic Colleges for neglecting to instil into their pupils (especially of the wealthier classes) an appreciation of their social duties, the Bishop goes on to observe that such social instruction is entirely in accordance with the traditions of the Catholic Church. He then continues :

To succeed in this direction the priest must pay increased attention to his social apostolate, and must, in his direct relations with the temporal concerns of his flock, acquire a kind of habit of keeping Catholic doctrine constantly before his eyes. If he does this he will speedily be astonished at the amazing fecundity of his thoughts, and in consequence of his words.

In view of the recent growth of interest in social work among the clergy in some parts of Spain it will be interesting



to observe in what weighty terms the Spanish Bishops have given their approval to this movement.

The Bishop of Badajoz, in the course of an important speech delivered at Grenada in 1907, spoke as follows of the social activity of the clergy :

As for us, what are we doing? We remain in the sacristy just as the priests did in the eighteenth century, waiting to be summoned to confess the sick or to be called in to patch up family squabbles or to be consulted on a case of conscience: we do not see that in this present twentieth century the sick are dying wholesale without the sacraments, married couples are separating by common consent, and that cases are solved by reference not to conscience but to convenience. Our duty is precisely to come out of our sacristies and churches and cathedrals and monasteries without losing the spirit of God and without neglecting to invoke the assistance of Heaven. We must ascertain the actual condition of society, study its necessities and labour unceasingly not only with the poor but with the rich in christianizing everybody and everything, in "re-establishing all things in Christ," according to the motto of Pius X., learning modern tactics and employing the same weapons as our adversaries. . . . Leo XIII. commands us to "go to the people" and praises a loving solicitude for the people, saying that it befits the clergy both secular and regular. Pius X. repeats and confirms these directions. . . . It is of urgent importance, then, that the clergy who emphatically ought to be the soul of every enterprize accomplished in the name of Christ and His Church, should undertake a vigorous campaign of Catholic social action.

The Bishop of Madrid on the same occasion spoke as follows :

The priests must go to the people and strive to introduce economic and social reforms among them, they must shirk no sacrifices in the matter. What we have to do is to combine the apostolate of the workman by the workman with the apostolate conducted by the priest.

Quotations of this kind might be multiplied from the speeches and writings of the Spanish Bishops. In many cases they go on to instance the particular social works in which the co-operation of the clergy is desirable,—rural banks, syndicates, and so forth.

(ii.)

The second reason which is alleged in favour of the participation of the clergy in social work is that such participation is often in these days a necessary condition for the effective exercise of the priest's spiritual ministry.

In other words, the priest must get at people before he can



do them any good ; and it is becoming increasingly difficult to get at them except in the field of social work. This point is frequently insisted upon by Catholic Bishops on the Continent, and deserves careful attention.

Everything in these days depends upon organization. No interest can be secured without it. Labour must organize (as Leo XIII. so often pointed out) or it will be exploited by capital ; the professions must organize, commerce and industry must organize. The same tendency is seen in education, research, sport, and pleasure, as well as in politics and finance. We have to deal less and less with the individual and more and more with the organized group, or at least with the man as a member of an organized group. The people are crystallizing into a number of new combinations, and everything will depend upon the type of organization which they elect to form. We shall inevitably be dominated by organizations,—but of what kind are they to be? We cannot check the process ; the best thing we can do is to try to influence it. Labour (to take one example) will organize whether we will or no. Hence it would seem to be our duty to guide, so far as may be, the organization of labour towards a Christian type, to impress upon it our fundamental beliefs as to man's destiny and duties, the rights of the parent, the sanctity of marriage, the responsibilities of labour, Christian justice and charity, and so forth. Too often is the process of labour organization left in the hands of those who hold views on all these matters diametrically opposed to our own. To the priest, as a Christian teacher, it clearly belongs to bring Christian influences to bear as far as possible on the movement. If he leaves it to develop on merely secularistic lines he will find his flock entangled in organizations which will blunt their religious sense, withdraw them from Catholic influences, and secure their acquiescence in principles which the Catholic Church has always held in abhorrence.

Again, it is becoming increasingly necessary for the priest to take his place as a member of the various social groups (and especially as a member of those groups which aim directly at social reform) in order to keep in touch with his own flock. Parochial visiting in these days will not suffice. Men and women are becoming more and more inaccessible to the priest who has no "social" status. They are not to be found in their homes, partly because home life is degenerating and giving place to club life, and partly because their activities are increas-

ingly absorbed and controlled by the State, the municipality, and the large employer. Take for instance the enormous number of Catholics who find themselves in public institutions—prisons, workhouses, and so forth. The priest must have a social status if he is to get at them. He must have a well-defined and acknowledged position among those who control these institutions. Whatever be the upshot of the Poor Law Commission, the priest will have to take an active interest in the matter unless he wishes to find himself cut off from those of his flock who are affected by the new machinery of poor relief. He is scarcely likely to be welcomed by public authorities merely on account of his possession of sacred Orders. But he will be welcomed if he is known to be a zealous and experienced social worker whose counsel and influence cannot be dispensed with.

Once more, the labouring classes and the poor, who are keenly interested in the various projects which are being advanced for their material betterment, will be the more ready to seek close intercourse with their clergy if the clergy are known to have a deep and practical sympathy with movements for social reform. Enormous numbers of young Catholic workmen on the Continent have hitherto drifted out of touch with their priests because the latter have not shown themselves interested in the material betterment of the people. On the other hand (as will be shown in the subsequent paper), those priests who have concerned themselves with measures of social reform have been able to bring back multitudes of working men to the practice of their religion.

And lastly, under this heading, comes the consideration that in the interest of religion all are called upon to remove, so far as may be, the causes of destitution and degradation. A certain degree of civilization is normally necessary as a preliminary to sanctification. The initial work of wise foreign missionaries is often the production, among the people they desire to convert, of a stable social order. The family must be established, drunkenness checked, thrift and industry inculcated, the rudiments of agriculture, it may be, taught, before the people are capable of receiving religious instruction with profit. These preliminary efforts of the missionaries are not to be regarded as bribes. They are not in the same category with glass beads and airs on the cornet. They are a direct psychological preparation for the Gospel,—a making straight of the crooked paths of the human intellect and will. So were the foundations

laid in Paraguay, and so (to take one splendid instance) are they being laid by the Trappists in South Africa to-day.

Priests whose work lies in the slums of our great cities will have no difficulty in admitting that the methods of the foreign missionary may well find their place in certain parts of England to-day. Social amelioration is to a large extent prerequisite to acceptance of the Gospel message. For the degraded poverty which we see about us is something very different from the poverty commended by Christ. The latter strips men's hearts of human cares and attachments; the former weighs down the spirit of man with a crushing and demoralizing solicitude for the immediate needs of the body. Hence the priest, it is urged, may well stand forward as the promoter of social reform.

(iii.)

The third reason which is alleged for the participation of the Catholic clergy in social work is that Christian charity in these days demands it.

In other words, priests are called upon to interest themselves in social work, not merely because such work is a necessary condition of spiritual improvement, but also because such work is directly enjoined on them by the command of Christ that we should love our neighbour as ourselves for God's sake. Just as the clergy have ever been prominent in works of charity (in the narrower sense of the term), so in these days they need to be prominent in the promoting of social justice. The evils of modern society cannot be met by charitable endeavour alone. True, there will always be room for such endeavour, and the motive of Catholic charity needs to be vindicated in these days when men look to the State for the cure of all their distresses. But on the other hand, social justice must be promoted no less than charity, and in this work the Catholic clergy may be expected to take a leading part. In the present dislocation of society it is particularly necessary that priests, by exhortation and action, should strive to relieve suffering by insisting on social duties and responsibilities. The very same spirit which led them to work in the days of old for the liberation of captives, should lead them to work for the liberation of modern captives who are shackled by the chains imposed on them by economic injustice.

Whatever may be thought of the participation of the clergy

in party politics (and the question need not be raised here), it is evident that their participation in movements of social reform which transcend party politics is likely to be more lasting in its effects, more solid, and more sincere. There is no danger here of their alienating themselves from the sympathies of a portion of their flock. And whereas political activity must necessarily be intermittent, social activity calls for a steady and continuous effort. The former may be counteracted by intrigue, wire-pulling, and the incessant shifting of party policy. The latter is a slow and ever progressive building-up which, in the case of Catholic social work, rests upon an assured foundation. No shifting of policy can necessitate the cessation of efforts made to secure decent housing, a minimum wage, temperance, thrift, and the like. And social work lends itself easily to spiritualization. It is itself a school of Christian virtues. It touches revealed religion at a thousand points besides cultivating in those who are occupied in it the moral virtues upon which civilization is based.

Père Leroy, in eloquent pages which deserve careful study, makes it plain that the participation of the clergy in social work, so far from prejudicing sacerdotal dignity, is calculated to set the priest's spiritual functions in the highest relief. He lays particular stress upon what may be called the spiritual aspect of social work, the aspect with which the priest is particularly asked to concern himself. How far the clergy should occupy themselves with the purely material side of social activity will largely depend, he points out, upon circumstances of place and time. A priest in France will naturally show more reserve in this matter than a priest in Germany or Belgium. In any case no one will expect a priest to become a banker, a leader of industry, or a notary. But by speech and writing and some measure of direct action he may well take part in movements for the public well-being of which the purely material direction is in the hands of laymen. For these movements are, as has been said, intimately connected with religious amelioration.

The situation is summed up (so far as the French clergy are concerned) by Père Leroy in the following words:

It will be said that there is danger of abuses here. I do not deny it; but where is there not danger of abuse? . . . It would be unjust, speaking generally, to accuse the French clergy of leaving their sacristies too often; it would be more just to blame them for remaining there. If we compare their sins of commission with their sins of omission, the

latter very considerably exceed the former. The Catholic people have been despoiled of their rights and deceived in their need, not because their clergy have gone too far but because they have not gone far enough.

Cæsarian or royalist maxims, Jansenistic theology, gallican traditions, pharisaic liberalism, a groundless fear of public opinion, and a touchy sensitiveness to that opinion,—all these causes have produced the same result. They have brought about a kind of depression in the souls of our priests, from which arises their excessive timidity. One would often be tempted to say that they are banished from those among whom they live, that they are excluded from the light, air, and life shared by other citizens. The man who can speak to most advantage is reduced to silence; the man whose work is most necessary is condemned to inactivity.

Must we wait for a more serious peril before we break through this narrow circle? Has not the moment arrived for doing, with tranquil confidence, all the good that is in our power?

P.

## *Impressions of Father Gerard Hopkins, S.J.*

---

### III.

FATHER HOPKINS' theory of the contrapuntal character of the choruses in Milton's *Samson*, quoted in our last article, is an indication of the interest he took in music. This interest also showed itself in various essays in composition, exercised upon the verses of his friend Dixon. On September 22, 1881, the latter writes :

I shall look to hear the airs to which you have turned the two you speak of. I can only wonder : for the faculty of composing a musical air is one that I am entirely destitute of.

One of these melodies was briefly acknowledged on a postcard dated November 11, 1881.

The MSS. and the music arrived safe. The song is very beautiful : *i.e.*, the music to which you have set it : very rare and delicate.

A fuller appreciation followed on November 14th :

The song my daughter has played and sung : it seemed to me a very beautiful and appropriate melody : but I have no musical faculty. I judge of music only by general taste. I can catch and remember airs very distinctly, but cannot judge of harmony, and have no notion of composition. My daughter thinks it not unlike some of Mr. Metcalfe's settings. This did not strike me, but, if so, Metcalfe is a genius of very great scope : utterly unknown and more or less wasted but a genius still. He was for years the only person in Carlisle with whom I could exchange a word about art of any sort.

The other song may perhaps be referred to in a letter of January 22, 1882 :

The song seems to me singularly beautiful and proper to the words : which words are too much honoured in being wedded to such music. I have the air running in my head. My daughters have been trying it many times over and are charmed with it.


What particular songs were set to music and what has become of the scores we have not the means of saying. But,

to include all the evidence these old letters contain of Father Hopkins' musical ability, we may refer here to some notes of a later period. During his residence in Dublin Father Hopkins met and cultivated the friendship of the late Sir Robert Prescott Stewart, Mus. Doc., Organist and Professor of Music at Trinity, and he seems to have sent his compositions to that distinguished man for criticism. In this case, however, it was not poet meeting poet on equal terms, but amateur meeting expert. Judging from the three or four letters preserved by Hopkins he and the Professor must have been on terms of considerable intimacy, a fact which would probably take some of the sting from remarks like the following:<sup>1</sup>

My dear Padre . . . I send you—as a proof of our orthodoxy as Catholics!—the programme, by which you will see that that very motet of J. S. Bach you invite me to hear along with you was to be heard with me the other evening. It is likely we did it better (with our picked choir of twenty-five or thirty) than your “tag-rag-and-bobtail” levies will do it.

Indeed, my dear Padre, I cannot follow you through your maze of words in your letter of last week. I saw ere we had conversed ten minutes on our first meeting that you are one of those special pleaders who never believe yourself wrong in any respect. You always excuse yourself for anything I object to in your writing or music, so I think it a pity to disturb you in your happy dreams of perfect ability—nearly everything in your music was wrong, but you will not admit that to be the case. What does it matter? It will be all the same 100 years hence. There is one thing I do admire—your handwriting—I wish I could equal *that*; it is so scholarlike.

Stewart's letters—mere hurried notes occasionally in pencil—are not all dated, but the following seems called forth by Father Hopkins' answer to the above. It will be gathered that the poet and composer did somewhat resent his friend's plain speaking. Indeed, for so keen an aspirant for success in music to be complimented on his handwriting could not have been wholly pleasant.

Darling Padre! I never said anything “outrageous” to you. Don't think so, pray! But you are impatient of correction when you have previously made up your mind on any point, and I, R. S., being an “Expert,” you seem to me to err, oftentimes, very much. Thus you will not like to be told that  4 crotchet rests are not used, but one bar rest.

<sup>1</sup> May 22nd, year not mentioned, probably 1885 or 1886.



248 *Impressions of Father Gerard Hopkins, S.J.*

And so on through several pages of technical criticisms, ending thus—

Is your music a duet for two tenors, or is it a four-voice piece as in ending verse? This latter form is much the best, most accurate, most rational, most in the proper compass for your voices. But to accompany a tenor duet first and then to drop all accompaniment, and end with a new choral setting is wanting in coherent plan. . . .

In a third letter, returning some MS. music of Hopkins, the Professor writes—

I mark all I dislike. You are very much improved, I rejoice to say. . . . Can you play Pianoforte at all? If so, get Bach's 48 P and F; they are "A 1 at Lloyds." If you were my son instead of my father I could give you no better advice than to study and play this truly incomparable work.

Along with these letters there are several MS. music scores containing various experiments in counterpoint and one "Old English" song, all copiously annotated by Stewart both in the way of praise and correction. There is here enough evidence that Father Hopkins' essays in musical composition had not the success of his poetry. He may have been too impatient of rule, too eager to try new effects, too regardless of tradition, to make ✓ a good musician. Or it may be that if he had lived he would have achieved success in that art also under the vigorous schooling of Sir Robert Stewart. In any case these few letters are another indication of how he won the hearts of his friends, for, antecedently, there was little enough to unite a Protestant of Trinity with a Jesuit of the Royal twenty years his junior. We may now return to the Anglican of Carlisle, who, not being a professional musician, was able unaffectedly to admire his friend's compositions. In the letter previously quoted (January 28, 1882), after paying tribute to the "song," he goes on to speak of Father Hopkins' poetry.

As to the first part [of your letter] in which you speak of your poetry, and its relation to your profession, I cannot but take courage to hope that the day will come, when so health-breathing and purely powerful a faculty as you have been gifted with may find its proper issue in the world. Bridges struck the truth long ago when he said to me that your poems more carried him out of himself than those of any ✓ one. I have again and again felt the same; and am certain that as a means of serving, I will not say your cause, but religion, you cannot have a more powerful instrument than your own verses. They have, of course with all possible differences of originality on both sides, the



quality which Taine has marked in Milton and which is more to be noted in his minor poems than in his great ones—of *admiration*—I forget Taine's expression, but it means admiration (or in you other emotions also) which reaches its fulness and completeness in giving the exact aspect of the thing it takes: so that a peculiar contentation is felt.

Father Hopkins' advice as regards his friend's poetry is frequently and cordially acknowledged, but it would serve little purpose to treat of it in detail. How detailed it was may be judged by the following:

I shall when time allows go through my manuscripts with your letters in hand, and greatly improve them by the process. (November 14, 1881.)

After the date of the last letter quoted in our previous article (April 13, 1882) occurs a gap of sixteen months, which we cannot think existed in the actual correspondence. If it did, Dixon's next letter (August 12, 1883) would have shown more regret than it does.

I have left your last kind and interesting letter too long unanswered; . . . I like the sonnet on "Earth the Creature" which you sent, very much, as I do all your work: it has the rareness, the sweetness, that is in all: and could have been written by none other. Of the other poem that you mention, on Our Lady, it is probably the same that Bridges has mentioned to me, saying that it is "admirable"—"Our Lady compared to the Air we breathe."

About this time Dixon's historical work led him to investigate the mission of the first Jesuits to Ireland in 1541, and he naturally turned to his Jesuit friend for help. Much space in the subsequent letters is taken up with discussions of this enterprise. On the general question of his treatment of the Society Dixon some time before<sup>1</sup> had written thus:

I do not know whether you have fallen in with what I have said about the Institution of your Society in my History: but I have had a dread that you might be hurt thereby, if you happened to do so. I meant to be deeply respectful: but was, I think, liable to misunderstanding. If you have not, I hope you may not: but if you have, I hope you will see that I have tried not to be offensive, though I have been, as I think, too free, and what may be called "hoity-toity." I hope to make amends, if I live long enough, to come upon the period when I can do so.

<sup>1</sup> November 4, 1881.

His opportunity came when he was treating of Irish ecclesiastical affairs in 1551, "a dreadful time," as he calls it,<sup>1</sup> when he gives a brief *résumé* of Jesuit activity there and indicates his obligations in a footnote,<sup>2</sup> thus :

The following account of the first Jesuit mission into Ireland is compiled from the valuable volume entitled *Ibernia Ignatiana*. . . . The author is the Rev. Edmond Hogan, S.J., who has drawn from materials that seem unknown to the historians of the Order that are generally read. For my knowledge of this volume and for other information I am indebted to my gifted friend, the Rev. Gerard Hopkins, S.J.

In the autumn of 1883 Dixon thanks Father Hopkins very warmly for "interesting Mr. Patmore in my poems." There is no evidence that the connection thus established became at all as intimate as that resulting from the previous introduction of Dixon to Mr. Bridges, but it was maintained nevertheless. Dixon mentions, in April, 1884, having received from Patmore a copy of his son's poems, of which he says "they seem truly exquisite." And in Patmore's *Life*<sup>3</sup> there is a letter to Mr. Bridges wherein the former expresses his pleasure at hearing that Canon Dixon is writing lyrics. It is about this date that Patmore's letters to Father Hopkins begin, to which we must presently turn. Towards the end of 1883 Dixon was transferred to the incumbency of Warkworth in Northumberland, and Father Hopkins to the Royal University, Dublin. From this time the letters become less frequent. Dixon was increasingly busy—"I am, like you, nearly stifled with work and shall be all week writing against time: not for gain, for that I seldom do: but at my Bishop's command." The next note of interest is dated June 21, 1886, in which, after stating that Routledge has asked him to compile a Bible Birthday Book, Dixon says :

I want to include at least one of yours. Bridges gave me the following out of his MS. of your poems.

The dappled die-away  
Cheek, and wimpled lip,  
The gold-wisp, the aery-grey  
Eye, all in fellowship—  
This, all this, beauty blooming,  
This, all this, freshness fuming,  
Give God, while worth consuming.

<sup>1</sup> In a later letter (April 14, 1884) he states frankly, "The doings of the Reformation in Ireland were abominable."

<sup>2</sup> *History of the Church of England*, vol. iii. pp. 418, 419.

<sup>3</sup> Vol. ii. p. 247.

May I take it? If so, can you put a text before it?<sup>1</sup> . . . I am truly glad and happy to hear from Bridges of the restoration of your health, and of the affection with which all there regarded you.

The last letter in the collection is dated July 7, 1887, nearly two years before Father Hopkins' death. Again, it is difficult to think that the correspondence ceased so abruptly and for so long, but later letters may have been shorter and more business-like. But the series, as it stands, shows, directly and by reflection, the course of a very charming literary friendship, in which each man was a source of "healing and consolation" to the other. The relations disclosed in the Patmore letters are not nearly so intimate and affectionate, although the mutual esteem was not less real. Patmore appears to have a less sympathetic character than Dixon, in fact, Dr. Garnett, in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, denies him any power of literary sympathy at all.

An egotist and a mystic, he could take no vital interest in any one's ideas but his own.

Again—a more qualified appreciation—

Haughty, imperious, combative, sardonic, he was at the same time sensitive, susceptible, and capable of deep tenderness. He was at once magnanimous and rancorous: egotistic and capriciously generous: acute and credulous, nobly veracious, and prone to the wildest exaggerations, partly imputable to the exuberance of his quaint humour.

However this may be, his attitude towards Father Hopkins in literary matters was uniformly and highly appreciative, although more discriminating than Canon Dixon's. His "My dear Sir," and "My dear Mr. Hopkins"—Catholic though he was, never once does he address the priest by the usual title—contrast markedly with Dixon's "My dear, dear friend," and profusion of affectionate greetings. But he always showed a real deference to Hopkins' critical opinions. When they first became acquainted we cannot say. Patmore was over twenty years older, and had published poetry before Hopkins was born. There is no evidence in Mr. Basil Champneys' *Coventry Patmore*, that they were personally acquainted before the autumn of 1883, when Patmore paid a visit to Stonyhurst, and as Father Hopkins was there then, it is reasonable to suppose that was the first occasion of their meeting. Also, the series of letters from

<sup>1</sup> These lines duly appeared in the *Bible Birthday Book*, under the name of "First Fruits."

Patmore preserved by Father Hopkins, begins after this visit. The biography just mentioned contains other letters which show the high esteem which Patmore speedily conceived for Father Hopkins.

To me [he writes to Mr. Bridges, May 2, 1884], his poetry has the effect of veins of pure gold imbedded in masses of impracticable quartz. He assures me that his "thoughts involuntary moved" in such numbers, and that he did not write them from preconceived theories. I cannot understand it. His genius is, however, unmistakable, and is lovely and unique in its effects whenever he approximates to the ordinary rules of composition.

Again, a few days later,

I wish I had not had to tell Hopkins of my objections. But I had either to be silent or to say the truth; and silence would have implied more difference than I felt.

I have seldom felt so much attracted towards any man as I have been towards him, and I shall be more sorry than I can say if my criticisms have hurt him.

Mr. Champneys publishes also some ten pages of letters out of a large collection which Father Hopkins wrote to Patmore. Some of these will be helpful in throwing light upon the answers to which we now turn.

In his first letter, written on his return home from Stonyhurst, Patmore says:

I have written to my publisher to ask him to send you my books. I am proud to remember that they will find a place in the College Library when you shall have looked them over. If you have time to do so, and to send me a note of any defects which have escaped me, before my next edition goes to press, I shall be very grateful.

Father Hopkins took the writer at his word, for he seems always to have delighted and excelled in criticism of poetry. The piece subjected to his comments would appear to be "The Angel in the House."

I am exceedingly grateful to you for the trouble you are taking in sending me such carefully considered notes and suggestions, with nearly all of which I agree, and nearly all of which I shall endeavour to adopt. . . . If I can I will set it right [the impression, *i.e.*, that Honoria was really "vain"], but at this distance of time from the composition of the poem it is very dangerous to make more than verbal alterations. I cannot recover the mood in which I wrote, and were I to remodel a passage, however short, I fear the alteration would look like a patch of a different colour.

The following has a more general reference,

Your careful and subtle fault-finding is the greatest praise my poetry has ever received. It makes me almost inclined to begin to sing again after I thought I had given over. I agree with all, or very nearly all, your objections.

which he then begins to discuss in detail. One realizes from the *minutiae* considered, the force of Mr. Champneys' remark that the series of Hopkins' letters would be "most serviceable to any one who undertook to draw up a complete *variorum* edition of Patmore's poems."<sup>1</sup> In the next letter we have mention of Father Hopkins' metrical theories which so puzzled and interested Dixon.

I shall give your remarks on the metrical Essay [an early prose work of Patmore's], my best consideration, together with the rules of the "new Prosody" which Mr. Bridges has promised to explain to me, before I reprint that Essay . . . meantime, I will only say that much of the substance of your very valuable notes will come in rather as a development than as a correction of the ideas which I have endeavoured . . . to express. . . .

This and several subsequent letters refer to the character and abilities of the poet's eldest son, whose premature death cut short a career of exceptional promise. Father Hopkins shared with many others a high opinion of his great poetical powers. The stream of suggestions as to his own poems still poured in, and Patmore writes (January 5, 1884):

As usual, I agree with most of your remarks, though I may not be able to act on all those with which I agree, because they would involve an amount of revision which could only be executed in the presence of the feeling which is gone past [recovery] . . .

As to what you note of the paragraph in the *Spectator*, I shall not consider myself "out of the running" so long as there are a dozen men in England to think or speak of the "Unknown Eros" as you do. I fancy I must have a cavern in my brain where the love of popularity ought to be, which I may say without fear of the retort of "sour grapes," inasmuch as the "Angel" obtained for me at one time a very sufficient taste of public applause.

Up to this time Patmore had known Father Hopkins only as a critic, but now he learnt of his critic's poetical work, and

<sup>1</sup> *Coventry Patmore*, vol. ii. p. 345.

naturally enough wished to see how he put his own theories into practice.

Mr. Bridges and Mr. Gosse [he writes, January 28, 1884] have excited much desire in me to see some of your poems in MS. I have felt somewhat shy of taking the liberty of asking you, but Mr. Bridges encourages me to hope that you will not refuse my request.

The MS. was duly sent, but Patmore did not report his impressions of them for several weeks, being, as he said, "conscious of my extreme slowness in taking fully in what is new." In Dixon and Mr. Bridges Father Hopkins found minds in many respects akin to his own: here it was not so. When he did write he expressed what is probably the opinion of most readers of Father Hopkins' poetry: it may be his plain speaking on this occasion was what he referred to in his letter to Mr. Bridges quoted above:

I have read your poems—most of them several times—and find my first impression confirmed with each reading. It seems to me that the thought and feeling of these poems, if expressed without any obscuring novelty of mode, are such as often to require the whole attention to apprehend and digest them: and are therefore of a kind to appeal only to a few. But to this already sufficiently arduous character of such poetry you seem to me to have added the difficulty of following *several* entirely novel and simultaneous experiments in versification and construction, together with an altogether unprecedented system of alliteration and compound-words—any one of which novelties would be startling and productive of distraction from the poetic matter to be expressed. System and learned theory are manifest in all these experiments; but they seem to me to be *too* manifest. To me they often darken the thought and feeling which all arts and artifices of language should only illustrate: and I often find it as hard to follow you as I have found it to follow the darkest parts of Browning. . . . "Thoughts that *voluntary* move harmonious numbers" is, I suppose, the best definition of poetry that ever was spoken. Whenever your thoughts forget your theories, they do so move, and no one who knows what poetry is can mistake them for anything but poetry. "The Blessed Virgin compared to the Air we breathe" and a few other pieces are exquisite to my mind, but in these you have attained to move almost unconsciously in your self-imposed shackles, and consequently the ear follows you without much interruption from the surprise of such novelties; and I can conceive that after a while they would become additional delights. But I do not think that I could ever become sufficiently accustomed to your favourite poem—"The Wreck of the *Deutschland*"—to reconcile me to its strangeness. . . .

I do not see how I can say more without going into the matter at very great length indeed; and after all, I might very likely be wrong, for I see that Bridges goes along with you where I cannot and where I do not believe that I ever could; and I deliberately recognize in the author of "Prometheus" a sounder and more delicate tact than my own. . . . Bridges' appreciation is a fact that I cannot get over. I cannot understand his not seeing defects in your system which I seem to see so clearly; and when I do not understand a man's ignorance, I obey the Philosopher and think myself ignorant of his understanding. So please do not rely upon impressions which I distrust myself.

Father Hopkins, as Sir Robert Stewart was experiencing about this time, was not a man to accept such strictures without some attempt at justification. His critic fell back once more on his own intellectual limitations.

At the very time [he writes, April 5, 1884] your letter came, this afternoon, I was feeling very anxious as to how you might have received my last. My difficulty in getting at anything very new is, as I said before, greater than that of most persons: and sometimes that difficulty seems insuperable. It struck me, however, at once that the key to them might be supplied by your own reading of them; and I trust some day to have the benefit of that assistance. . . . The partiality and limitation of my appreciation of art often surprises myself. I have the most acute delight in some of the best music, but it seems a mere accident. . . .

What you say concerning your modes of composition disposes at once of some of what I thought were sound critical objections against writing upon theory, &c., but *how* such modes, or at least some of them, as, for example, your alliteration, come to be the spontaneous expression of your poetical feeling, I cannot understand and I do not think I ever shall. . . . I cannot help being a little amused by your claiming for your style the extreme of popular character. But after all perhaps that is the secret of my being so insensible to its peculiar merits. I never could understand "the people"—indeed, I may say with Sir Thomas Browne, that the People is the only entity I sincerely hate. If you succeed in pleasing them with your potato-style<sup>1</sup> as much as you do me when you write in your ambrosia-manner (as in "Wild Air," &c.) you may claim an almost incomparable universality of influence.

Pray let me have one line some day to say that, however much you may despise me, you are not offended.

We presume that Father Hopkins accepted the position with sufficient equanimity: there is certainly no hint of his having been in any way estranged by his friend's frankness, and

<sup>1</sup> Hopkins had spoken to him of the "Potato-Poet"—perhaps William Barnes.



their epistolary intercourse continued unbroken. In the letters that follow immediately they are on the safe ground of common admiration of Mr. Bridges' poetic fecundity. Then in April, 1885, comes an allusion to a work on our Lady which Patmore seems to have contemplated, and which Father Hopkins vehemently urged him to carry through.

I believe that I have done all that it will be possible for me to do in the way of fulfilling the intention you speak of, but I do not think the work will ever take the form of a poem. I have written a series of notes which I propose shall be published after my death, under the title of "*Sponsa Dei*." I do not think they would be more, or so, impressive in verse. They lend themselves as little to verse as the Epistles of St. Paul would do—though there ends their likeness. . . . The new edition of the *Angel* comes out this or next month. I think I have adopted about two-thirds of your suggestions. I agree with all, but have got too far away from my first feeling to dare any corrections which involve re-writing.

When Father Hopkins received a copy of the new edition he wrote :

To dip into it was like opening a basket of violets. To have criticized it looks now like meddling with the altar vessels : yet they too are burnished with wash-leather.

In his next letter the poet again gratefully acknowledges the share his critic had in "polishing" the poem.

A very good critic assures me that your suggested corrections have had a very decided effect on the impression made by the whole poem. It is wonderful how two or three awkward or unpolished lines deteriorate (*sic*) from a whole volume.

During this summer Patmore made several efforts to secure a meeting with his friend, offering to call at Stonyhurst if necessary.

But what of course would be the greatest pleasure to me [he writes from Hastings] would be a visit, if possible, from you here. I assure you that I shall always regard my having made your acquaintance as an important event of my life, and there are few things I desire more than a renewal of opportunity of personal intercourse with you.

The visit to Hastings actually came off in August of that year (1885), and the two friends spent a week together. During this visit Hopkins was given the prose-work "*Sponsa Dei*" to



read. The result is told in a letter of Patmore's to Mr. Bridges<sup>1</sup> after Hopkins' death :

The authority of his goodness was so great with me that I threw the manuscript of a little book—a sort of “Religio Poetae”—into the fire, simply because, when he read it, he said with a grave look, “That's telling secrets.” This little book had been the work of ten years' continual meditations, and could not but have made a greater effect than all the rest I have ever written : but his doubt was final with me.

However, the writer delayed for over two years before acting on his friend's supposed hint. Dr. Garnett conjectures that other reasons as well may have influenced him. Father Hopkins himself, when he heard of the book's destruction, wrote to regret it.<sup>2</sup>

Your news was that you had burnt the book called “Sponsa Dei,” and that, on reflection upon remarks of mine. I wish I had been more guarded in making them. When we take a step like this we are forced to condemn ourselves : either our work should never have been done or never undone. . . . My objections were not final : they were but considerations (I forget now, with one exception, what they were) even if they were valid, still, if you had kept to your custom of consulting your director, as you said you should, the book might have appeared with no change, or slight ones.

The remaining letters of the collection—the last was written on May 11, 1888, thirteen months before Father Hopkins' death—although full of interest regarding Patmore's own views and writings, add little to our knowledge of his correspondent. Patmore, though not yet sixty-five, was suffering a good deal in health, and he delighted in the younger man's letters. “I am always raised in spirits by the sight of your handwriting” begins, in sense at least, several of his replies. Father Hopkins kept an eye on Patmore's prose-writings in the *St. James's Gazette*, and more than once expressed doubts of their theological soundness which the writer was at pains to remove. As a final record of Patmore's esteem for his friend we cannot do better than quote a passage from a letter which he wrote to Mr. Bridges on August 12, 1889 :

I can well understand how terrible a loss you have suffered in the death of Gerard Hopkins—you who saw so much more of him than I did. I spent three days with him at Stonyhurst, and he stayed a week

<sup>1</sup> August 12, 1889. See *Coventry Patmore*, vol. ii. p. 249.

<sup>2</sup> *Coventry Patmore*, vol. ii. pp. 351, 352, from a letter dated May 6, 1888.

with me here: and that, with the exception of a somewhat abundant correspondence by letter, is all the communication I had with him: but this was enough to awaken in me a reverence and affection, the like of which I have never felt for any other man but one, that one being Frederick Greenwood, who for more than a quarter of a century has been the sole true and heroic politician and journalist in our degraded land. Gerard Hopkins was the only orthodox and, as far as I could see, saintly man in whom religion had absolutely no narrowing effect upon his general opinions and sympathies. A Catholic of the most scrupulous strictness, he could nevertheless see the Holy Spirit in all goodness, truth, and beauty: and there was something in all his words and manners which were at once a rebuke and an attraction to all who could only aspire to be like him.<sup>1</sup>

There are other letters in the collection before us—from Bishop Creighton, Professor Rhys, and others of eminence—but they are not the letters of intimates, and merely indicate a recognition of their recipient's learning or taste. The others we have quoted from so largely have, we hope, given some indication of Father Hopkins' character and natural gifts. His death in the very prime of his years allows us only to conjecture what the further development of his powers would have led to. Meanwhile, in view of the impression which they made on men themselves of such ability, we venture to repeat that it would be sad if his poems were finally left to the obscurity of anthologies.

J. K.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 249.

## “The Problem of Evolution.”

---

ON the 13th, 14th, and 17th of February, 1907, Father Erich Wasmann, S.J., delivered in Berlin a series of three lectures, now published in English form under the above title by Messrs. Kegan Paul and Co. These attracted a very considerable share of attention, chiefly for two reasons. In the first place it was declared by many to constitute an audacious novelty that a Catholic priest, and above all a Jesuit, should hold any parley with evolutionists, should consent to discuss their doctrines on purely scientific grounds, and even allow that these doctrines may, at least to some considerable extent, be true. He should, thought such persons, have condemned them root and branch on grounds entirely theological; some, as Professor Haeckel and Dr. Hansemann, appeared to consider it actually dishonest that one in Father Wasmann's position should even profess any sort of sympathy with evolution or Darwinism, as being a contradiction of what he himself is known to hold. In addition to this, Father Wasmann is known to men of science as having done much original work in the life-study especially of the *inquilines*,<sup>1</sup> or parasites, residing as guests or slaves amongst colonies of ants or termites (white ants). On account of his recognized authority in this department, Professor Haeckel characteristically speaks of Father Wasmann as the “Ant man” (*der Ameise Mann*).

The lectures in question were largely attended, both by a general audience, which testified to the interest excited in all quarters by the nature of the subject, and by leading men of science, of whom no less than eleven, representing views hostile to those of the lecturer, took part in a discussion which followed on the evening of February 18th—on which occasion, it may be remarked, after all his opponents had spoken, Father Wasmann was limited for his reply to one half-hour immediately before midnight.

It is not here proposed to attempt any full examination

<sup>1</sup> From *inquilinus*, for *incolinus*, “a sojourner in a place not its own.”

either of the lectures themselves or of the various criticisms passed upon them, some of which appear to have little or nothing to do with the real question at issue, and to be concerned rather with the attitude of the Catholic Church towards science, and the alleged impossibility of that freedom being conceded to a Catholic which the study of science necessarily requires. It will be more profitable to consider the more general question, and to examine what would appear to be the real position of the doctrine of evolution in face of the scientific world.

It is necessary, in the first place, to determine what, precisely, is meant by the term "Evolution," and to what those must be understood to commit themselves who profess their acceptance of this doctrine. According to some, everyone is an evolutionist who does not maintain that species are for ever fixed and permanent, so that no species can ever be changed into another. Such was the meaning of the term which seems to have been adopted by Professor Huxley when, on occasion of the Oxford meeting of the British Association in 1894, he claimed the late Lord Salisbury as a convert to the doctrine of evolution, on the ground that he had admitted the possibility, or even probability, of such changes having actually occurred. But such an admission, startling as it undoubtedly was to the older naturalists, trained in the school of Linnæus, goes but a very short way towards the belief which will satisfy those who regard evolution as the most vital factor in the production of the present organic world, not to speak of the inorganic as well. According to these authorities, all animals have been naturally developed from some one ancestral form, and all plants from another, if indeed animals and plants are not ultimately to be traced to an unknown elemental organism, which has itself been spontaneously generated from inorganic matter.

Others again, attempting a deeper and more final philosophy, and calling themselves "Monists," maintain that the world which we know through our senses is all that exists, that it is eternal and self-sufficing, all that is in nature being but the outcome of its ceaseless transformations. Such a system evidently implies a denial of God, or any First Cause distinct from the material universe itself, and is thus incompatible with Christianity, or even with Theism, which cannot necessarily be said of the evolutionary creeds previously described.

Two more questions necessarily suggest themselves. Firstly,

is it correct to identify evolution, as is so often done, with Darwinism? Secondly, restricting ourselves to the mere question of historical fact, can it be held that man himself has been evolved by a purely natural process from brute progenitors?

In regard of these various questions, Father Wasmann acknowledges that in the first and more restricted sense of the term he is a convinced evolutionist, that is to say, he considers it to be scientifically established that new species, genera, and families<sup>1</sup> have been evolved by natural forces from previous forms altogether different.

In support of this opinion, Father Wasmann naturally lays special stress upon those creatures with which he is himself practically familiar, although, as he notes,<sup>2</sup> similar arguments may be brought from other departments of biology. As he tells us,<sup>3</sup>

Hundreds of kinds of ants are known through their having been preserved in the tertiary amber of the Baltic and Sicily. Amongst them are several genera which still exist, but scarcely a species that is identical with the present ones. We can hardly avoid coming to the conclusion that our ants are the *descendants* of these fossil varieties, and that they have come into being by way of natural evolution of the race, and not by way of a new creation.

The same is found to hold good in regard of Termites, and in an even more remarkable degree of the parasites, or *inquilines*, which dwell amongst both classes of insects. Of these, various photographs were exhibited by Father Wasmann, which unfortunately are not reproduced in the published form, though they would obviously contribute much to the understanding of the argument. Amongst other strange things, we learn that one such guest, *Dinarda*, a kind of beetle, which lives with ants, is still producing new forms; still more remarkably, the East Indian *Doryloxenus* has in comparatively recent times ceased to consort with ants and associated itself with Termites,

<sup>1</sup> As these terms will frequently be employed, it is necessary clearly to understand their signification.

Various *species* may be included in one *genus* (as the lion, tiger, and puma in the genus *felis*): various *genera* in one *family* or tribe (e.g., we have the cat tribe, *felidae*, and the dog tribe, *canidae*, the latter comprising dogs, wolves, jackals, foxes, &c.): various *families* are united in one *order* (as *carnivora*, containing those above mentioned, as well as *mustelidae*, weasels, &c., *ungulates*, *rodents*, *whales*, *bats*). Orders are distributed in *classes*, as *Mammals*, *Birds*, *Reptiles*, *Batrachians*, *Fishes*; finally, the whole animal kingdom is divided into two *sub-kingsdoms*, viz., *Vertebrates*, or back-boned animals, to which belong all the above, and *Invertebrates*, having no back-bone, as insects, crustaceans, molluscs, worms, star-fish, &c.

<sup>2</sup> P. 3.

<sup>3</sup> P. 10.

"thus being changed into new systematic varieties." The brachyopteron beetle *Mimiceton pulex*, or ant-ape, lives amongst the blind wandering ants of Brazil, "and is enabled to pursue its parasitic existence through bearing a remarkable resemblance to the ants in the form of its antennae and its whole body. The ants' sense of touch is deceived by this resemblance." Finally, to quote but one instance more,

*Anergates atratulus* possesses no real workers, but only winged females and wingless, strangely degenerate males, so that this ant is in absolute dependence upon the workers of the wood ants, amongst whom it lives. This parasitic ant must be descended from a genus that possessed workers and once led an independent existence.<sup>1</sup>

Such is Father Wasmann's conclusion, which must necessarily depend upon indirect evidence, for, as he insists<sup>2</sup> (here, as elsewhere, the italics are his) :

The doctrine of evolution is obviously *not an experimental science*; it is a hypothetical construction which reduces itself to a theory. It is only capable of giving us a higher or lower degree of *probability* as to the processes of historical development.

No man ever has had, or will have, the opportunity of watching the actual formation of a species, and the observations which de Vries and others have thought to do something in this direction are not generally accepted as having the importance once assigned to them. All that is possible is to examine what inference the phenomena within our observation naturally suggest, and as Father Wasmann maintains,<sup>3</sup>

The principle of evolution is the only one which supplies us with a natural explanation of these phenomena.

Thus far, then, he professes himself a convinced evolutionist, but this evidently goes but a little way towards acceptance of the evolution theory in such a form as will satisfy those who with most reason claim it as their own, for if it be only within such limits that this system can be justified, the whole problem seems to remain as unsolved as ever.

Our lecturer goes on to inquire to what extent we are to accept the evolution theory, and to this question he returns the obvious answer,<sup>4</sup> "*Just so far as its application is supported by actual proofs*;" and when he proceeds further and asks how far this may be, his reply will naturally grievously disappoint many of those who are fond of speaking on the subject. In

<sup>1</sup> P. 12.<sup>2</sup> P. 6.<sup>3</sup> P. 14.<sup>4</sup> P. 14.

brief, he comes to the conclusion that there is no scientific support for the idea of evolution from one original stock, but that what evolution may have been must have had various starting-points, each of which must have been independent of the others. Moreover, what proof we have of evolution actually occurring is always discoverable amongst species and genera which are manifestly near akin to one another, and as differences of more fundamental character occur it becomes increasingly difficult to trace any bond of connection between forms between which they intervene. As we read :<sup>1</sup>

In the case of the species of the same genus, the genera of the same family, and often for families of the same order,—even for orders of the same class, *the probability is in support of evolution*, and we meet with actual points of contact proving the relationship of the various forms. But the higher we ascend in the systematic categories, and the more closely we approach the great chief types of the animal world, the scantier becomes the evidence; in fact, it fails so completely that we are finally forced to acknowledge that *the assumption of a monophyletic evolution of the whole kingdom of organic life is a delightful dream without any scientific support*. The same may be said of the assumed monophyletic evolution of the whole animal kingdom on the one hand, and of the whole vegetable kingdom on the other, from one primary form respectively.

So serious is this difficulty felt to be, that, as we gather from Father Wasmann,<sup>2</sup> some scientific authorities have devised a restricted theory of genetic permanence, and have "introduced the idea of natural species, comprising groups, varying in size, of systematic species." It is added "*This theory of permanence, if compared with the historical theory of the systematic species, is however, already a restricted theory of evolution.*"

The meaning of this is not very easy to grasp. If there be "natural species," which are beyond evolutionary modification, then there is in nature a factor of potency superior to those upon which evolution depends, and no explanation of the world can be satisfactory which does not take account of this.

Thus Father Wasmann, though he does not agree with Professor Fleischmann's wholesale condemnation of the evolution theory, concurs with his declaration that "*it is impossible to trace back the chief types of the animal kingdom to one primitive form,*" and with that of Oskar Hertwig, "*Evidence of*

<sup>1</sup> P. 15.

<sup>2</sup> P. 4, note.



*the monophyletic development of different races is altogether wanting, and we are forced more and more to accept the theory of development from a variety of stocks."*<sup>1</sup>

On the remaining points dealt with by Father Wasmann we need not now dwell. The monistic doctrine, which amounts to simple pantheism, must be repudiated not only by every Christian, but by every Theist. It does not, however, come within the scope of physical science to examine, for sensible phenomena can afford no arguments either for or against it. Its discussion must be left to the province of metaphysics, which of course many who delight to call themselves "scientists"<sup>2</sup> will take to be equivalent to saying that we can have no real knowledge on the subject at all—for undoubtedly it is commonly assumed, especially at the present day, that there can be no true science save in the domain of physical science, and it is forgotten that, as has been truly observed,<sup>3</sup> "Metaphysics, after all, is only a particularly obstinate effort to think things out,"—and that unless things be rightly thought out we shall never arrive at sound knowledge.

As to the popular identification of Darwinism with the evolution theory, Father Wasmann has no difficulty in showing that although some high authorities have contributed to such identification, and even continue to do so, there is no justification for such a course. "Darwinism" is only one particular mode of accounting for evolution, and one, moreover, which is no longer accepted at the present day with so much favour as once it was amongst men of science.

Far more complex is the last question, as to the descent of man. *May the theory of evolution be applied to man, and if so, in what degree?* We may examine the question, replies Father Wasmann, under various aspects, zoological, palaeontological, and psychological. As to the latter, the answer is plain; man differs radically in respect of his intellectual powers, from any of the brutes, and his soul cannot have been evolved, by any natural process, from theirs. Considering his material part, his body, whether, as it now is, zoologically, or as it is found to have been at different epochs in the past, palaeontologically, it is of course undeniable that man is formed of materials precisely

<sup>1</sup> P. 15.

<sup>2</sup> We are sorry to see that Father Wasmann's translator constantly uses this objectionable term.

<sup>3</sup> *The Rational Basis of Theism*, by A. D. Kelly. (S.P.C.K.)

similar to those of which the lower animals are made up, that he is developed by just the same sort of processes, and is subject to the same organic laws. Moreover, many forms are discovered in the rocks which exhibit features which more and more assimilate his frame to that of what are recognized as the higher brutes, and colour is thus lent to the doctrine which teaches that he is but the final outcome of an evolutionary process which has resulted in his production. All this is undeniable, but as Father Wasmann insists, whilst the psychological argument wholly precludes such a conclusion, those adduced on the other side are always found to be inconclusive, and to appear less cogent the more thoroughly they are scrutinized. It used, for instance, to be assumed as indisputable that what was termed the biogenetic principle holds good, and that man in his individual embryonic development reproduces in succession a number of ancestral forms, constituting a conclusive proof of his descent from beasts. But, says Father Wasmann,<sup>1</sup> fuller knowledge leads distinguished men of science, as Von Baer and Hertwig, altogether to deny this once famous principle. So, again, of what are often described as rudimentary, but more correctly as vestigial organs, it is found that some which had once been considered wholly useless, and therefore mere records of the past, as the thyroid, thymus, and pineal glands, have proved to fulfil some definite purpose of biological importance,<sup>2</sup> thus conclusively teaching us how dangerous it is to attempt to make our own judgment the measure of such things.

In respect of what we commonly know as "Missing Links," the most notable feature is that they persistently continue to be missing. Often as the discovery of a true intermediary form between men and monkeys has been announced, not one has hitherto been found upon examination to merit such a place, but to each in turn has been assigned either truly human or truly simian rank.

Such then in brief is the sum of these lectures, which form a valuable contribution to our knowledge of a subject regarding which everyone now-a-days is expected to have an opinion, but which few men have time or opportunity to study to any good purpose for themselves. Father Wasmann has done us an important service in placing before the public the results of his own mature judgment and scientific industry and acumen.

J. G.

<sup>1</sup> P. 59.

<sup>2</sup> P. 64.

### *Mandeville's Travels.*

---

THERE is an appropriateness in the fact that our first piece of prose literature should have been a book of travels; and an added appropriateness in that its author should have been a humourist such as Mandeville. He is the first of the long golden roll of English travellers; the precursor of Borrow and Kinglake and Stevenson; his fragrant pages foreshadow the charm of Doughty's *Arabia Deserta*, and are filled with the same Catholic and human and laughter-stirring spirit that culminates in the crowningly joyous mood of *The Path to Rome*. It is in this sense that the title, "Father of English prose," is peculiarly his; for it was this pre-eminently native and vigorous portion of our literature that he was gaily inaugurating when, in his old age, he sat down at Liège, with his tongue in his cheek, to write his reminiscences.

In the chapter on the beginnings of English prose in the *Cambridge History of English Literature*, where the curiously-obscure question of the authorship of the *Travels* is treated with rare erudition and lucidity, Mandeville is described as starting "a new venture in literature." As was the case with Guillaume de Lorris, his first object in writing was *pour esgaier les cœurs*. It is, then, with this warmer and more human side of his writing, the chief virtue of which is that, like the spiced wine he describes, it "cleanseth the blode and putteth out Malencolye," that we are here concerned. The problem as to which parts of his fascinating volume are mutilated, which transposed, and which, in Pistol's phrase, conveyed,—the mildest verdict on the latter head charging him with pretty extensive piracy,—all this may be left to the antiquaries, whose discussions have reached the usual final stage of inquiry as to whether he existed at all; while we may safely rest content with the attitude of the general reader, for whom after all the book was primarily meant, and move the previous question, whether, as it stands, and even if it should turn out to be the

production of the mysterious Bearded William of Burgundy, it does not form an eminently pleasant and readable piece of literature.

The extraordinary and instant popularity of the *Travels*, a popularity and currency at the close of the fourteenth century, as Halliwell says, second only to that of the Bible, may be largely traced to the outlandish spirit with which he infused his story. The demand for stimulating fiction which has since found other channels, was singularly keen at the time; and Mandeville sat down resolutely to supply it. "Now is the tyme, if it like you," he says, with evident relish, "for to tell of the marches, and iles, and dyverse Bestes." In this latter respect, as a Bestiary that is, his book is certainly unrivalled. With a cunning hand he intersperses among his passages of Eastern colour minute descriptions of the grotesque animals he had seen on his travels, and also of some which he had undoubtedly never seen; his pages, filled with the beauties and perils of life, resemble those mediæval missal-paintings, where the Gothic crabbedness of the text is enclosed with a running pattern of marginal arabesques, while strange elfish creatures peer out from among the varied traceries and floral ornament.

Whenever he comes to describe the *fauna*,—and every chapter is aswarm with the subject,—he is sure to be felicitous. We have, at the commencement, the inevitable phœnix, for instance:

He hath a crest of fedres upon his head more gret than the Poocok hath; his nek is yalowe, the colour of an orielle, that is a ston well schynyng; and his bek is coloured blew and his wenges ben of purple colour and the tayle is zelow and red. . . . At 500 zeres end, the prestes arrayen here awtere honestly, and putten thereupon spices and sulphur vif and other thinges that wolen brenne lightly. Then the bryd Fenix comethe and breunethe himself to askes. Now the first day next after, men finden in the askes a worm; the second day next after men finden a bryd quyk and perfyte; and the thridde day next after he fleeth his wey. So there is no briddes of that kind in alle the world, but it allone. And treuly, that is gret mervaille.

His gryphons, man-eating dragons, and other such nightmare-chimæras have lost much of their startling novelty. They no longer stir a *frisson*; although to Mandeville's readers, it should be remembered, they were as stark and appalling, and aroused as much terror as do Mr. Wells's monster creations in our own day,—the huge and blood-curdling Martians stalking into

Surbiton. In earlier days the Gryphon was to the full as weird and eerie. To read of such uncanny animals was to taste Mr. Boffin's fascinated horror at the discovery of the number of "scarers in print." A milder attractiveness and interest still clings, however, to the less ferocious shapes in his menagerie; nor should we omit mention of what appears to be the uncomplaining Yak. In Tartary, he tells us, "men worschipe the ox for his symplenesse and for his meekenesse and for the profite that comethe of him. They maken the ox to labour six or seven zeer, and then thei ete him."

The Tartar who dwells on the plains of Thibet,  
A desolate region of snow,  
Has for centuries made it a nursery pet,  
And surely the Tartar should know.

One main ambition, the North Pole of all early travellers, was to win entrance to the Garden of Eden, that Earthly Paradise which lay, in Eastern phrase, under the shadow of swords. Here, at first sight, Mandeville's narrative seems to fail, for, conscious apparently of what would strike his readers as a painful hiatus, he admits apologetically, though with the most engaging candour, "of Paradys can not I speken properly: for I was not there." An exquisite reason; which, so far from staying the knight's pen, seems on the contrary but a fresh incentive to launch out into a voluble description of the wonders which there await the more successful explorer. The passage is, in more ways than one, characteristic. Without the vestige of anything approaching what lawyers call real evidence, he shows always the keenest zest in picking up and retailing whatever gossip is afloat. "Whoso that wole may beleve, zif he will; and whoso will not, may chuse." He had to cater for a generation whose appetite for the wonderful was omnivorous, and he does it lavishly. There was no question of creating a taste; the difficulty rather (though in his case it was no difficulty at all) was to provide an ever-fresh and unfailing stream of sensational anecdotes—the more wildly unlikely the better—for an audience which was nothing if not eagerly receptive. When, therefore, he comes across some regrettable gap in his narrative—and the *Paradys terrestre* is not a solitary instance—he regards it as a delightful opportunity of leaving the solid earth of fact and soaring into the larger zone of fancy.

The result is motley and, at first, a little bewildering. One is very soon able, however, if not actually to disentangle, to

recognize at all events the slender thread of truth that runs through his picturesque fabric ; and at the same time to admire, as one must, the ingenuity with which the more warmly-coloured portions (the lies, that is) are woven in. He deserves, besides, more credit than he has generally received for keeping, as in all but the confessedly extravagant parts of his book he does, the two strands of his material, the real and the fabulous, fairly separate. Perhaps it is the outcome merely of his rough and artless method : perhaps the two elements refused to coalesce : in any case they lie apart. There is an air, very possibly a deceptive air, of quiet truthfulness when he is writing as an actual eye-witness ; whereas it is when he takes his facts, as happens rather frequently, from the most general and loosest hearsay (rarely indeed allowing us any more reliable ground than the chance remark of a passing palmer, or Tartar, or Bedouin chief, "worthi fellowes"), that even the least disputatious reader is left hesitating.

There is a further feature of the book which deserves a less qualified admiration, and exhibits the writer in the then novel character of a travelled Englishman who could afford to think imperially. He considers that we may even find something to learn from the ways and ideas of distant peoples ; showing in this a decided advance on the tentative opinion of Virgilius of Salzburg, that there probably existed "a good rascally sort of topsy-turvy fellows on the other side of the globe." He is anxious to communicate to his readers something of this breezy cosmopolitanism. Not of course that any overtly instructive purpose is the uninterrupted attribute of his garrulous narrative ; for he shows a frank divergence from the style of the didactic writer ; but he had spent the flower of his life abroad, and one collateral outcome of these long years of bronzing travel appears to have been the conviction that England was not so central as his countrymen supposed, and that the hub of the universe—the "navele"—was to be found, if anywhere, somewhere vaguely in the Levant ; a position, which he proves (wrongly as later critics assure us) from the fact that a lance planted in the sands of Palestine at noonday casts no shadow. He was the first to exploit the notion, which is becoming now something of a nuisance, that those only know England who have practically never seen it. Prince of globetrotters, as he was, it became his duty to indoctrinate the little Englishers of the day with his wider views and experience ; for, as he says with

sly irony, "What partie of the earth men dwell in, outhur aboven or benethen, it seemeth always to hem that thei gon more righte than any other folk."

To disabuse his readers, then, of such insular and narrow arrogance was an object he had at all events half-consciously in view; and that he might secure as widespread a circulation as possible he adopted a triple form of publication: a Latin version, which Dr. Vogels has proved to have been somebody else's production, for the clergy and the more lettered portion of his audience; English for the man in the street; and a Romance or French translation for the class which he describes as "Lordes and Knyghtes and other noble and worthi men that conne Latyn but litylle." A book that should be readable and uproariously sensational was what Mandeville aimed at; nor, to judge from the triumphant statistics, which Halliwell gives, did he miscalculate. It was a sheer *succès de fou*.

No book which has not some share of the originality that makes for "human pleasure" can ever be read, after a season or two, by other than specialists; it is therefore no matter of surprise that the qualities which formerly secured its popularity still gift the *Travels* with such lingering attractiveness as it yet has: the charm of individuality is its very life-blood. A little judicious criticism, or rather the mere lapse of time, has reduced his framework of facts to the condition of a riddled target. Nobody, we may safely say, wants to know his way to Hierusalem, or even the alternative and extremely baffling overland route, which he considerately plans for "such as may not suffer the savour of the sea, but hadden lever to gon by londe." If such has been the fate of his information and statistics, we may be pretty certain that, were it not for the presence of some higher saving qualities, his writing, a great deal of which is directly concerned with notions resembling Mr. Wegg's, in that they are mostly speculative and all wrong, would as a whole have shared the same fate. As it is, however, the outer shell merely has fallen aside; while the inner core of humour is yet sound and pleasing.

It is impossible to approach so random and chaotically discursive a writer in systematic fashion; the most one can do is, perhaps, to single out some of the more salient passages and leave them to speak for themselves. His opening pages are emphatically of the kind called arresting. The very table of contents is exactly calculated to rouse the reader's—the



mediaeval reader's—curiosity, which would be whetted to a yet keener edge by the promise-crammed and exciting Preface. Extensive citation would be needed to impart its full flavour, a treatment which is inconvenient, for the preamble is “too combrous,” as he would say, “and too long to putten in scripture of Bokes.” Yet such headings as these, for instance, are characteristic, and hold out prospects of fine confused reading to follow :

Of the drie tree and how roses came first into the world ;—of the customs of Sarasines and how the Soudan reasoned with me, Auctour of this Book ;—of the difference betwixt Ydoles and Simulacres ;—of 3 maner of growing peper upon o tree ;—of the ryalle estate of Prestre John and of a riche man that made a marveyllous Castelle and cleped it Paradys ; and of his sotyltee ;—the Castle of the sparrow hawk and of a fayre Lady of fayrye that kepethe it.

Nor does he ever suffer the interest to flag ; the further eastward he travels, from the known to the unknown, the more blithe and expansive he becomes, marvels are piled on marvels with steadily growing *rinforzando* ; so that while we listened to his earlier chapters in what Mark Twain somewhere calls “the large silence that suggests doubt,” his later extravaganzas can only be received in a spirit of resigned bewilderment and leave us passive at the very nadir of preposterous nonsense. A suspicion that perhaps he was rather overtaxing his reader's faith, seems, towards the close, to break upon him with something of the pain of a new idea ; for, after a more than usually daring flight, he murmurs in a rueful undertone, “alle be it that sum men wil not trow me.”

Before passing on to Prester John and the Sultan, with both of which potentates he represents himself as being on the most intimate and confidential footing, we may dwell very briefly on his earlier and less mythical experiences. One is reminded at the outset of his nationality ; the usual tourist's growl finds a droll echo in his indignant discovery that in some village where he stayed, in the midst of a “sondy” wilderness, not a drop of ale was to be had ; and almost the first impression he received is summed up in the advice that “it behoveth the Cristene men to bear Vitaylle with hem ; for thei schulle fynd there no good.” To minor miseries of this sort he soon became acclimatized. What he found less easy to forgive, and what he comments on with a broadside of abusiveness that might have satisfied Cobbett, was the agricultural apathy, which, content with

meagre gleanings where it might have reaped a hundredfold, allowed such leagues of soil to lie waste and unreclaimed. Much of it he bitterly describes as

a ful ill lande and a sondye, and wel lytel fruyt berynge. For thare groweth lytel goude of corne or wyn, ne benes, ne pese; and treuly no gode man scholde not dwellen in that contre. For the lond and the contre is not worthi Houndes to dwelle inne.

There mingle, thus, with his mercurial vivacity and the easy playfulness of the *vieil esprit gaulois*, shrewdness, virility, homespun commonsense and many of the other qualities which are generally classed as essentially and solidly Saxon. His outlook has all the keen perceptiveness of his famous contemporary: he has Chaucer's "close, silent eye." He notices with admiration, and also with something of the heated feeling of a recent victim, the cunning business capacities of the Chinaman, who for ways that are dark seems even then to have been pre-eminent; "for of sotyltee and of malice and of fercastyng thei passen alle men under Hevene." So, again, his *caveat* to intending purchasers of Balsam, a warning which has a little lost in point and commercial force, marks the same trait.

Now wyte zee well [he says] that a man oughte to take gode kepe for to bye Bawme, but zif he can know it righte well; for he may righte lyghtly be disceyved. For men sellen a gome they clepen Turbentyne in stede of Bawme; and they putten thereto a little Bawme for to geven gode odour; and some destyllen cloves of Gylofre and spykenard of Spayne and other spices that ben well smellynge and the lykour that goeth out thereof they clepe it Bawme: and they wenen that they han Bawme; and they have non.

An unessential but allied characteristic is that he carries the impression of an English environment along with him, as well as his predilections. Except that he tells us at times that the tropic noon was "far more hoot than in our parties," the atmosphere throughout is occidental. We never seem, as we do in reading Villehardouin or Marco Polo, to get deeper into the East. His enemies have of course fastened on the plausible inference that he never got there himself; these are extremists, however, "misbeleevyng wights;" if Dr. Vogels has exploded the Latin version which passed under Mandeville's name, the English prose account has so far withstood the German sappers, and Schönborn, a thoroughgoing *Quellenforscher*, is convinced that it reflects a genuine voyage. Such probing may be left to

the antiquaries, whose writings, by the way, recall very forcibly what Mandeville says of the "Rewme of Arabye. It is a full gret contree : but therein is over moche dysert." What we rather advert to here is that, while his descriptions have all the keen freshness, they convey very little of the warmth and local colour of first-hand impressions. It is not into the atmosphere of *Eothen*, among domes and cupolas and fantastic minarets, the glamour and strangeness of some "rose-red city half as old as Time," that he takes us, but through surroundings where we still seem to move among the winding ways, the gables and spires of mediæval England. He is as complete a contrast as can well be imagined in this, as in other respects, to so exotic and half-Orientalized an impressionist as Lafcadio Hearn, and foreshadows rather the uninvolved directness of Borrow's nature,—solid, masculine and straight in the grain.

Perhaps the proudest passage in his chequered experience was his connection with the Sultan, who, if we may take the knight's own word, had a warm regard, indeed an overwhelming personal affection, for the English *attaché*.

I duelled with him [he tells us] as Soudyour in his Werres agen the Bedoynes. And he wolde have maryed me full highly to a gret Princes daughtre, zif I wolde han forsaken my lawe and my Beleve. But I thonke God I had no wille to don it.

And further on he retails a probably quite imaginary conversation, in the course of which the same dignitary administered a rebuke, general rather than personal, in words which Mandeville seems to think his co-religionists at home would do well to profit by.

I schalle therefore telle you what the Soudan tolde me upon a day, in his chambre. He leet voyden out of his chambre alle maner of men, Lordes and othere : for he wolde speke with me in conseil. And then he asked me, how the Cristene men governed hem in our coundree. "Righte wel," I seyde to him, "thonked be God." And he said to me, "Treulyche, nay ; for zee Cristene men ne recthen righte noghte how trewly to serve God. . . . And there with alle thei ben so prowde, that thei knowen not how to ben clothed ; now long, now schort, now streyt, now large, now swerded, now daggered, and in alle manere gysen. They scholden ben symple, meke and trewe and fulle of Almes dede as He was in whom thei trowe ; but thei ben alle the contrarie."

The rebuke, we may trust, was not thrown away ; the knight, at all events, preserved a dignified silence, although this

latter circumstance might be otherwise explained, as he informs us in another passage that it was ill arguing with the "Soudan," whose "meynee lift up in highe with their wepenes, for to smyte upon hem, zif thei seye any woord, that is displesance to the Soudan."

His sojourn at the Court of Prester John supplies his closing chapters with another patch of imperial purple. He is amusingly anxious that his hearers should be duly impressed with the lofty circles he has moved in; and rarely omits an opportunity of informing us that he has supped with princes. Other pages—notably the devout epilogue, which Johnson, in the well-known Preface, singles out and commends for its "force of thought and beauty of expression,"—might be chosen to exhibit the higher qualities of his mind; but no more charming and cardinal example could be cited to illustrate his pleasing *naïveté* than the sections devoted to Prester John. A few lines may here be given. The author is seated in a place of honour, and the usual banquet is going forward.

At Grete Solempne Festes, before the Emperoures table, men bryngen grete tables of gold and thereon hav pecokes of gold and many other manere of dyverse foules, alle of gold, richly wrought and enamelled; and men maken hem dauncen and syngen, clappyng here wenges togydere and maken gret noyse: now, where it be by craft or by nygromancye, I wot nere; but it is a gode sight to behold, and a fair.

Colonel Yule, whose scholarly and fascinating *Cathay and the Way thither*, forms so splendid a tribute to the early Catholic missionaries and explorers, Rubruquis, Plano Carpini, John of Monte Corvino and other brave Franciscans, has traced Mandeville's famous description of the Perilous Valley to the itinerary of Friar Odoric, and has also, incidentally, reversed Purchas's well-known opinion as to the relative claims of the two latter. He hesitates, however, in sanctioning the sweeping judgment of Mandeville's account as spurious. It seems safe, therefore, under shelter of so able an authority, to consider the passage based on a groundwork of real experience,—touched up possibly, afterwards for publication; and as, in addition, it is supposed to have influenced Bunyan in a celebrated incident of his allegory, besides being written in Mandeville's most characteristic vein, a portion may here be cited as a final example of his spirit, although compression is needed, and his flowingly-discursive style does not gain by compression. One of the

"Frere Menoures" was Odoric, the riches of whose book, Mandeville, at a later date, ruthlessly looted.

There weren with us two worthi men, Frere Menoures, that weren of Lombardy, that said, if ony wolde entrein thei wold go in with us. When thei hadden said so, upon the gracyous trust of God, we leet synge Masse, and made every man to ben schryven and houseld: and thaune we entered 14 personnes, but at our goyng out wee weren but 9. . . . And we found therein gold and silver and precyous stones and jewels gret plentee; but whether that it was as us seemed, I wot nere; for I towched none, because that the Deeveles ben so subtile to mak a thyng to seem otherwise than it is, for to disceyve mankynd: and therefore I towched none, also because that I wolde not ben put out of my Devocioun; for I was more devoute thaune, than ever I was before or after.

To the last the same charm of light-heartedness pervades his cheerful and cursory reflections. Like the Persian wine which he tasted and commended rapturously, as being of a "right noble sentiment," his pages bring a savour with them and a delicate exhilaration. They have the magical, rejuvenating effect of the forest-well, one healing draught of which, he says, had gifted him with a sense of perpetual youthfulness. It would be churlishness, surely, to read him in a solemn spirit of hyper-criticism; to mistake his flashes of cheerful pleasantry for sober fact. There were superfluous and unexplored blank spaces on his chart which had to be covered somehow,—and why not with full-sailed galleons, wallowing sea-monsters, and spouting whales? We miss his meaning when we forget that the avowed object of his book was, as Gower said of the *Confessio Amantis*, "between earnest and game;" the latter ingredient, in Mandeville's case, invariably predominating; so much so indeed that even when he was harnessing for his last quest and adventure, and was already in the gloom and shadow of the Vale Perilous, it was Hope rather than his sense of humour that he left behind.

HAROLD BINNS.

## *A Second-hand Mission.*

---

"WE'RE after having a Mission, over beyond in Bullaun."

I saw by the way Mrs. Gillivan laid down her plate, after wiping it carefully on her not over-clean apron, that she had no intention of taking her leave just yet, so sitting on the parapet of the terrace I prepared myself to receive whatever information she intended to impart. The second of the three steps leading to the porch is usually a favoured seat, but the Cot—for so my visitor is best known by her intimates,—the Cot prefers a posture all her own.

Squatting on the gravel, she leans her back against the corner stone pillar of the balustrade, thus balancing herself without recourse to her hands, which have to be kept free to gesticulate according as her speech requires. Her feet, hardened by much walking, are drawn in under her petticoats, and her ankles, bound with many-coloured rags, are also hidden from view. Her black cloak falls in folds around her, shrouding the stains that besprinkle her blue-check apron and her red flannel petticoat indiscriminately. The outlines of her face, once beautiful but hardened now by exposure—and maybe by other things—are softened by the frill of her white cap, not spotless, yet fairly clean.

If any one had gone down the avenue during the course of our conversation, they would have found a bundle under the last laurel bush on the right-hand side, and also a small and lidded tin can. These constituted, as far as I know, the whole of the Cot's earthly possessions, at least they were all she brought with her on her rounds, "and what roof have I, saving the roof of Heaven?" was her only reference to a home.

I knew the reason of her homeless state, but some things have to be ignored, and this was one of them. I also knew that because of this reason the poor Cot had, in practice at least, given up her religion these years back, therefore her reference to the Mission, as though she had taken part in it, surprised me not a little.

"I knew there had been a Mission," I said tentatively, not quite sure what was expected of me. "I saw the tents one day I was down there, but Mrs. Kinsella never told me you were at it, Mrs. Gillivan, though she said she had the house full every night."

"Well, and 't would have been a lie for her, an' she saying it," retorted the Cot with a sniff, but the contempt had gone from her voice, when, as an afterthought, she added: "God help the creature!"

"Oh, I thought you always lodged at the Kinsella's," I said innocently. I saw her hand go instinctively to the bosom of her ragged dress, but as the fingers touched what they sought, they fell again to her lap. I knew she was longing for her after-dinner pipe, but this was another thing to be ignored. Politeness bade us both be silent concerning the cherished clay-cuddy that when not in her mouth, lay close above her heart.

"An' 'twas right you are in thinking that, where else have I gone, in Bullaun these twenty years and more. Twenty-three years every day of it, an' then to think I have to forgive what she said to me, an' me thinkin' I'd never forget it on her. Well, well, God knows best, to be sure."

"Wasn't she glad to see you?" I asked.

"'Twas the opening day of the Mission, acushla, when I came landing in the town, and who should I meet trapësing the street but Mrs. Kinsella, no less, an' she in her Sunday bonnet. 'Is that yourself, Mrs. Kinsella dear?' says I, 'an' you with your bonnet all askew.' An' 'twas the truth of Heaven, that same, but d' you think it was gratitude she had for me? no fear! 'Favour for favour then, Mrs. Gillivan,' says she, 'an' you've a smudge across your nose as black as me shoe.' Twenty-three years, backward and forward, I'd been laying on her hearth, an' that was all the gratitude I got——"

I waited a moment for further explanations, but this seemingly was all of the mortal offence, for she went on to other details.

"'Twas to Corny Farrell's I went after that, lookin' for a light for me pi—, for an air of the fire, an' who should come in, an' me sitting there but the Missioner himself. A lovely man, God bless him, an' a beautiful Father confessor. I'd no idea since what Mrs. Kinsella was after saying to me to stop an hour in the place," she went on. "But the Missioner, Father Angellus they called him, he'd have me stop, good, bad, or



indifferent. You've heard, daughter, what's kept me back these years?"

Her voice sank to a whisper, for this was the nearest approach to the ignored topic that had ever passed between us. I nodded a silent affirmative.

"'Twas the purpose of amindment," she went on, almost as though she were talking to herself. "The firm purpose of amindment. He kept on at me howsomedever till I got vexed like, God forgive me. An' says I to him, 'Amn't I old enough to mind me own soul?' says I.

"'You're not then,' says he sharp like. 'True you're old enough an' near enough to death not to go tempting Providence this way. Where'll you go to, you misfortunate creature,' says he, 'an' you to die in your sins?'

"'I'm an old woman as you says,' says I, an' me fairly riz, 'an' I likes a warm corner.' Oh, acushla dear, I did say that to him, an' with that he up's, an' the eyes of him went through me like a pair o' brads" (awls).

"'A bad old man is bad enough,' says he, 'but a bad old woman is the very devil.'

"'The very devil!' that's what he said, no less. 'The very devil!' an' me sixty-seven years of age."

The ever-useful apron, that had lately performed the task of a dish-cloth, was now called into use as a pocket-handkerchief. Then suddenly she looked up at me.

"'It's the grand Father confessor he is, acushla," she said. "The grand Father confessor, an' me not next or nigh the sacraments—God forgive me that same—these sixteen years! 'Twas night an' me finished, for wasn't it only right that the likes o' me should be the last of all to go?"

"'Is there e'er a one in the chapel yet?' says he, an' he gettin' out o' the box.

"'Sorra one but myself, Father dear,' says I.

"'Who's that?' says he, for 'twas dark an' black, with nothing but the weensy glimmer from the altar lamp, and the cloak was over me head and face. He riz it back with his hand, an' oh, the beautiful words he says. 'It's you, is it?' says he. 'Go then, me child,' says he, 'go an' sin no more.'

Once again the apron was called into use; I should have liked to have heard something of the next morning, but so much was vouchsafed, that I felt I could not ask from her details that were not freely offered. I know the chapel at

Bullaun, bare and benchless. I have seen it filled on a Sunday morning, and so can fancy the way it is crowded during a Mission.

"Was there a good attendance?" I asked.

"Good! you may say so. Wasn't I in it morning an' night, an' never missed a day for the three whole weeks, and 'tis thronged it was, no less."

"I suppose the other priest was the best preacher? Favour seems usually to be so divided at Missions, one Missioner being sought after as a confessor, whilst the other was looked upon as the finest preacher."

"Not a bit of it," replied Mrs. Gillivan, quickly. "He was good enough, I daresay, but he was only the second-best priest all round. Father Angellus was the great speaker; oh, acushla dear, 'twould do your heart good to hear the sermon he gave on Hell!"

"I think I'd rather hear him preach on Heaven," I said. "Wouldn't you sooner hear about God's mercy than His justice?"

"Wisha, haven't we His mercy with us every day of our lives," she replied, contemptuous at my stupidity. "It's not the likes of us that needs to be put in mind of God's mercy, for where would we be at all without it? But the fires of Hell! God help us, don't we forget them in our sins."

"Was it on the closing night Father Angellus preached on Hell?" I asked.

"Not at all," replied the Cot. "'Twas the other man who spoke that night; but wait now, till I tell you how Father Angellus had the fellows caught." She chuckled to herself at the remembrance, and once again her fingers sought her pipe.

"'Hold up y'r rosary beads,' said he, an' divil a man, but very few, had beads with them to hold up. 'Is that all?' he says, an' again he says it. Then, 'Hold up y'r pipes,' says he, an' every hand o' man or boy in all the throng was held up, though not a know did they know the reason why he asked it. 'Shame,' says he, an' you'd a heard a pin fall, only there wasn't room, acushla, in the throng for even a pin to stir. 'Shame,' says he, in a still sort of a voice. 'There's ne'er a one forgets his pipe, but the rosary beads that helped your fathers to keep their faith in God! Troth, I suppose they're too heavy for the likes of you to carry.'

"I was mostly the last to get home of an evening, acushla, an'

there wasn't a beads left on the stalls, an' me passing that night though goin' in, I seen them there in heaps."

"What day did the Mission close? Last Sunday, was it?"

"No, but on the feast-day it closed," said the Cot. "I mind well, for the second-best priest had great things to tell us about the saints. Didn't he tell us how one o' the poor gentlemen took a terrible fall, an' him ridin' a horse-baste."

"Which gentleman?" I asked, completely mystified at the new turn the conversation had taken.

"Well, I disremember which one," she replied. "Whist, now, but 'twas St. Paul, for St. Peter is the gentleman that has the locking of Heaven's gates, an' didn't they lock him in jail himself, the rascal, only between him an' the angel they had them finely caught after!"

"I—I don't exactly remember about St. Paul," I said, anxious not to appear too ignorant, yet very wishful to extract a further *résumé* of the sermon.

"Didn't the horse go trip," said the Cot, "and Paul was pitched right on top of his head, an' when he got up he couldn't see a stim, so he got converted after that, and wasn't he the great Saint."

"Tell me about St. Peter, too," I urged.

"'Twas him they put in prison, away in foreign parts," she continued, nothing loth, "I couldn't tell you why, an' wasn't he tired, the poor gentleman, tired an' weary, an' when he went for to take off him, he fell asleep on the straw they'd left him, but didn't an angel come in to him there. 'Peter,' says the angel. 'Sorr,' says Peter, wakin' up. 'Put on your brogues, Peter,' says the angel, 'an' follow me.' An' with that the two of them quits out of it, an' away with them, and when the low rascals that had him caught came in, wasn't he gone from them clean an' clever." She chuckled to herself with such enjoyment over the discomfiture of St. Peter's captors, that I was able quite naturally to join my laugh with hers.

"Wasn't that the grand trick to play them!" she said, but as she spoke, I saw her feet appear below her ragged skirt, and I knew that the interview, which I would willingly have prolonged, was drawing to a close, and that no answer was expected of me. "Well, now, I've been keeping you," she went on, "an' I'd best be movin' on." I felt that some word of congratulation was necessary, and I tried to say how truly glad I was of what she had told me about herself.

"I'm sure you must feel very glad yourself, Mrs. Gillivan," I concluded, "and—and very happy now."

"It isn't happy, acushla," she explained. "There's two parts in me, an' one part is just Heaven in me heart, but the other——." She paused a minute, and pulled back her cloak. "There's me pledge badge," she said, "taken for life, an' with the help o' God I'll keep it. But, but there's only one way, daughter, an' it's a terrible hard way for me, after seven an' thirty years under the free air of God." She saw I did not understand, and so she went on quietly. "In summer time, with God's help, I'll keep temptation from me, but when the days is cold and the nights is long an' dark, an' there's light and warmth where the whiskey is, daughter, I couldn't live without the drop that's brought me where I am to-day, so I promised Father Angellus on the first of winter to the poor-house I'd go. God help me! the thought has me nigh killed! 'I'd sooner die,' says I to him, 'I'd sooner die on the roadside, now the peace of God is on me.' 'You weighted down the Cross of Christ,' says he, 'but you don't care now to lift it from Him, even though He'll pay you with a crown in Heaven.'

"For sixteen years, that's what I'm after doing, weighting down His Cross, an' think, daughter, think, He's after forgivin' me."

Her face, on a level now with my own, was white and drawn. "Sixteen years," she murmured, "if it's His will, sixteen winters to be spent in the poor-house, just to pay Him what I can!" She shuddered, even at the thought, and yet she faced it willingly, knowing that therein lay her hope of safety. "It's a long while, daughter," she said, "sixteen years, an' me an old woman this minute. Maybe—I wouldn't be askin' it of Him—but maybe He'll not be countin' every one."

I picked up her stick and placed it in her hand.

"God's good, acushla," she said, "God's good, an' may He power His blessings upon you, this moment and for ever."

ALICE DEASE.

## *The Theory of Unearned Increment.*

---

POLITICS lie outside the province of this periodical, but the philosophy of ethics and natural law comes well within it. We do not need, then, to offer any apology for examining into the soundness of a certain theory which is now much before the public, the theory, we mean, of the rightful ownership of what is called "unearned increment." On the contrary, since the Seventh Commandment bids us respect the property of others, this theory has some important moral bearings, and it seems desirable that Catholic readers should be induced to study it in the light of the principles which Catholic philosophers have laid down. We shall, however, rigidly limit ourselves to the philosophical and moral question, and eschew all discussion of the present or any other Budget in its allocation of financial burdens among the different classes of citizens or kinds of property.

The conception of unearned increment rests on the distinction between increments of value accruing to a man's property from his own labour, as happens when he farms his land, and those accruing to it from the labour of others, as happens when the coming of a new railway imparts to it a high value for building purposes. In the first instance, it is allowed that the increment, being due to his own efforts, should be regarded as earned by him, and therefore as in strict equity his own. In the second instance, it is contended by those who have coined the phrase that the increment, being due to the efforts of others, is unearned as regards the putative owner, and hence, though the law may count it to be his property, it is in strict equity not his, but the property of those whose labour created it; or else of the State or municipality which represents them in their collective character. The question before us is as to the soundness of this theory of proprietary right.

The question is usually raised in connection with property in land. In that case the increments of value are frequently very large, whilst the labour of the owners seems slight in

comparison. But it has not been difficult to show that there are other kinds of property to which the same considerations apply. Shareholders and stockholders, when once they have completed their investments, do nothing further save receive their dividends or their interest, the value of their investments meanwhile going up or down under the influence of conditions due largely to the action and industry of others. Original shareholders, for instance, in the Army and Navy Stores, have seen their property increase thirty-fold or more in value during the interval, all being due to the skill, energy, and industry of the directors and their staff on the one hand, and the increase in the number of their customers on the other; whilst they themselves have done nothing more than cast an occasional vote at their general meetings. Pictures, again, are a species of property which sometimes acquire a large increment of value and bring fortune to their possessors, not because of their own efforts, but because discerning judges have discovered their merits or authorship, or even because of some arbitrary change in popular taste. The crazes for old oak furniture, blue china, old pewter, afford other instances of increments of value enabling possessors to sell at high prices articles which they themselves bought at very small prices.

It is, however, necessary to make a distinction. The Army and Navy Stores' directors profit by their labour in two ways. They are themselves shareholders and benefit personally by the increased value of their shares which is due to their directive ability. They also receive a salary from the general body of the shareholders for the service rendered to the latter. And in this particular the staff is in the same category with them. They are all paid for their labour at what is supposed to be the price of it, and the payment comes out of the pockets of the shareholders. These, then, may fairly claim that having paid for the services of directors and staff, the latter at all events have no further proprietary claim on them. But what about the customers to whose copious inflow the increased value of the concern is proximately due?

Here we touch upon a point which is vital to the issue before us, and it is important to notice that it applies not merely to the species of property to which we have been referring, but to property of every kind, real or personal, physical or intellectual. In all these species of property the distinction between value for use and value for exchange has

to be borne in mind, together with the conditions under which these two values emerge and are interrelated. If a man has no wish to sell his property, it is about its capacity to supply his personal wants that he is alone concerned, but, if he wishes to sell it, his hopes of doing so at a good price rest on the number and insistency of those who may wish to purchase it. In other words, whilst the value for use is derived from qualities intrinsic to the property in question, the value for exchange, though ultimately limited by the value for use, and so far forth by qualities that are intrinsic, is proximately determined by qualities that are extrinsic to it, and intrinsic in the possible purchasers. It might, indeed, be thought that this distinction is too absolutely assigned. The house, it might be thought, which a man builds on his own ground, receives an increment of value even for use, from the railway or the good shops, or the libraries, or social advantages which other men bring into the neighbourhood—all which are elements extrinsic to the property itself. In a sense, and a very real sense, this no doubt is true, that is to say, for purposes of ordinary negotiation and action. But, if we are submitting the notion of value to scientific analysis, it is more correct to regard all these extrinsic elements as constituents of exchange-value, not of use-value. For the near neighbourhood of railways, shops, or libraries, merely involves that the owner of the house can purchase at a comparatively cheap rate, commodities for which otherwise he would have to pay more, or perhaps, for which otherwise the price would be prohibitive; and the value for social amenities is likewise reducible to value for an exchange, which is not the less such because it is not an exchange through buying and selling. We may say, then, with scientific accuracy, that what the owner of the house gains by the development of the neighbourhood, is that he can buy cheaper and sell more easily than he could have otherwise done, and with what he acquires by these purchases and sales, he can the better develop the intrinsic or use-value of his property. And we may conclude, so far, that it is the exchange-value, not the use-value of his property, which is directly affected by the industry of his neighbours.<sup>1</sup>

The immediate conclusion which we wish to draw from these

<sup>1</sup> A leaseholder of course effects intrinsic increments of value, but the effect of leases does not need to be considered in the argument of the text. A lease is a perfectly intelligible contract in which each party finds his advantage.



obvious facts is that, if it be true, as some contend, that in the case of landed property the increments of value due to the activity of others who have come into the neighbourhood and improved it by their presence and industry, ought in equity to be regarded as their property rather than the property of the legal owners, the same must hold for the case of increments of value in every other species of property—since wherever there is real or possible transfer through buying or selling, there enters in as a co-determinant of value the same extrinsic element, namely, the number and insistency of those ready to purchase. Yet unexpected results would follow if this consistent application of the theory of unearned increment were enforced. For purchasers, whether of food or clothes, or books, or concert-tickets, could then claim that, having added to the value of the shops and music-halls they had acquired a co-proprietary right in the increased value of the owners' stock, and the owners' premises. Of course it would follow just as much, if this theory were adopted, that the providers of food, or clothes, or books, or concerts could claim a co-proprietary right in the increased value of the property of their customers—for have they not increased its value by bringing their stores of food, clothes, and concerts so near to it? This shows that the two supposed claims to unearned increment neutralize each other, but it is further true to state that what happens is that landlords and tenants, householders and lodgers, solicitors and clients, doctors and patients, tradesmen and customers, amusement-seekers and providers, when they coalesce in the same neighbourhood and change its character from rural to urban, come there and make their ventures and contracts, each class with a view to the improvement of its own incomes or the satisfaction of its own tastes, without any desire or intention (save perhaps incidentally) to add by its efforts to the value of the property of its neighbours. If the latter do benefit by their labours they benefit only indirectly, and as we have noted, the benefaction is reciprocated, so that in the ultimate outcome each class gains its advantage from its dealings with the others—which is just what ought to result from commercial and social exchanges. There is then no room for the application of a theory of unearned increment, since an automatically-acting law awards to each his own proportionate share of the increments due to the interchange of services in which he takes part. There can indeed be individual instances, more or less numerous, in which one person or another fails to

get his fair due owing to the harshness of others who trade on his necessities, and far-reaching social injustices and cruelties are attributable to this cause. All our endeavours need to be directed much more seriously than they are to the healing of this wound, still, it does not originate in any defect of the proprietary conditions with which we are now concerned, but in the abuse of them by unfeeling or thoughtless persons.

So much on the assumption that the theory of unearned increment wishes only to transfer the increments of one man's property into the pockets of that other man, or those other men, whose industry is supposed to have created them. But in fact the claim is that these increments should be taken by the municipality, or even by the State. This is a still less intelligible feature in the theory. If A by his labour has created an increment of *a* to B's property, and B by his labour has created an increment of *b* to A's property, and, if C, D, E, F, &c., have created similar increments to one another's property, by what title can the municipality step in—even if we assume that these various increments do not perfectly neutralize one another, but leave a balance of advantage to some owners as against others—and claim the totality of these increments in the name of the general community? Obviously the citizens A, B, C, &c., would prefer to keep what they have of increment created by others in their own property, as the equivalent of what they have created in the property of others. The municipality, and similarly the State, confers on all the citizens the incalculable advantage of good government, besides owning and administering certain works which from their nature are best entrusted to those who have the care of all. And this undoubtedly entitles both municipality and State to exact rates and taxes which should be proportioned to the incomes of the citizens. But to claim rates and taxes from the citizens is one thing, to claim what is styled unearned increment from them is quite another. The former is to claim that they should pay over some portion of what is recognized as their own for an expenditure from which they in common with their neighbours derive security and profit; the latter is to claim that they should deliver up some portion which is declared to be not really their own.

We have been presupposing that the term "unearned" is applicable in itself to those increments of value to a man's property which have been created by the activity of others rather

than by his own ; and we have sought only to show (1) that the term, if admitted, cannot be limited to property in land only, but must be extended to every kind of property, as there is always and essentially an unearned element in the constitution of its exchange-value ; (2) that where men living in proximity form into a community their beneficial action on one another's property is mutual, so that the respective unearned increments compensate for one another. Now we must go a step further and dispute altogether the propriety of the terms "earned" or "unearned" in this connection. For to earn, if we wish to take the term literally, is applicable only to the case in which one man hires out his labour to another. Thus to hire out labour involves a contract in which the condition is that in return for the labour bestowed by a man in an employer's service wages shall be paid him on an agreed scale. If after this contract made the man has bestowed his labour as agreed, he is said to have earned his wages ; if he has failed to bestow his labour as agreed he has not earned his wages. But if no contract between the two has preceded, and yet one man bestows his labour on another's property, he earns nothing by so doing, though the other is the gainer by his work. This other may perhaps pay him something for his services, but if so he does it gratuitously, though in many cases very properly, but the man cannot be said to have earned the payment. On the other hand, except metaphorically, no man is said to earn by the work he bestows on his own property. If he bestows it advantageously the resultant increment is his gain ; if he bestows it unsuitably or does not bestow it at all, the decrement is his loss. *Res crescit aut perit domino*, the jurists have always said.

Here, however, we may be called to account by those who maintain that the only valid title to property in any material object, is the labour spent on its production and cultivation. For if that be so it might seem that the landholder, having himself, as is assumed, applied no labour to his property by which its value has been increased, can have no just title to such increments, whilst the neighbours to whose industry these increments are really due have by parity of reason a just title to them. It is an important objection, the examination into which will take us back to the roots of the theory we are concerned with. What, then, is the ultimate source of a man's right to his property ?

That a man has a natural right to use and consume the

fruits of the earth and other things which are indispensable for the support of life, for the maintenance of his wife, children, and others dependent on him, for the culture of his mind, and so on, no one would be absurd enough to doubt. Nor are there many who would doubt that he has by nature the right to stable property in things of this kind—the right, namely, to have certain things as his own property which he can retain, and transform or give or sell to others, according to his will, subject only to such limitations as are set by the rights of a higher order which may be in others. In further claiming that this right of stable property in the goods of the earth is not confined to goods required for direct use, but extends to the instruments of production, and even to the soil, we no longer meet with general acceptance, for there are many now-a-days who will allow no right of property save goods for personal use. However, we are not now raising the question of pure Socialism, and may assume as conceded by those whose theory of unearned increment we are criticizing, that property in the means of production, and in the soil of the earth, is lawful and (except in some very simple form of society) necessary. Indeed, if there was no lawful property in land no theory of unearned increment in land could arise; with the trunk would disappear the branches.

But the general right of man to hold property in land and other things is in itself indeterminate, and requires to be determined to these or those particular lands or things by some fact constituting his title to them. What, then, is that title? The most common titles no doubt are those of purchase or gift. But these are *derived* titles appertaining to the cases in which proprietary rights are transferred from one to another. What we seek is the *ultimate* title, or title by which things not already appropriated can be appropriated by this or that person—whose right of property thus acquired will involve the right to pass it on by sale or gift to others. Henry George, following in the wake of Saint-Simon, Karl Marx, and others, contended that the sole legitimate title by which a man could claim property in anything is that it is the fruit of his labour. This contention, though still cherished by the rank and file of the Socialistic party, is discarded by their leaders, for a very good reason. Man's labour cannot create, it can only transform, and presupposes, therefore, the materials which nature alone supplies—the wood if he is making an axe, the field and the

seed if he is raising a crop of wheat, the parent animals and their proper food if he is raising cattle. Whence does he acquire property in these indispensable prerequisites of his labour? Obviously not from labour itself, and hence labour, though undoubtedly it is a title to property, cannot be the ultimate title.

Another theory is that the ultimate title to property is to be sought in occupation, completed and confirmed by labour. That is to say, a man has a right to occupy goods which so far are unappropriated or abandoned, but this occupation is only initial and provisional. It must have been done in view of the labour it was intended to apply to the goods or soil occupied; but not until this labour has been incorporated in the goods or soil occupied can the right of possession be regarded as complete and unassailable. The flaw in this theory is that it fails to indicate the kind and amount of labour needful to render the right of occupation absolute. If a man occupies a piece of unappropriated land must he build a house on it, or sow a crop on it, and is it not his absolutely till the house is built or the crop reaped and garnered? If so, what long-enduring uncertainties and what occasions for disputes open out to him! Still, it is possible to understand this principle in a sense in which it approximates to a third and more generally accepted theory. This is the theory according to which the sole ultimate title is derived from the fact of occupation itself pure and simple, which leaves the occupier free to put or not to put labour into the things thus occupied. Still, the occupation in this theory must be made effective by some sufficient external manifestation that the man has occupied this thing or that land. If, for instance, he were to land on a new continent, and simply say, "I occupy all this for myself," his occupation would be nugatory. He must stake out the boundaries, map them out and register them, or mark the ground as his by some other distinct, sensible sign. And doubtless the best of all signs of effective occupation is by bestowing labour on the property annexed, by tilling the fields, applying the movable goods to manufacture, or enjoyment, or some other definite use; and it is in regard of this last-mentioned evidence of occupation that the title of occupation completed and confirmed by labour is reducible to the title of simple but effective occupation.

A convincing proof that this title of occupation is the only sound ultimate title, is that it is the title which all men in

practice instinctively go by. There is indeed no longer much, if any, unappropriated land to be thus occupied. The mass of those who now hold property in the soil have acquired it by the derivative titles of sale or gift, through which process it has exchanged hands over and over again in the course of ages; and even in new countries the State, as it had a perfect right to do, being itself a moral personality, has pre-occupied all, and gives or sells on its own conditions allotments to new colonists. Still, if any one did find a piece of unoccupied land he would instinctively feel himself entitled to occupy it, and would deeply resent any subsequent attempt on the part of another to dispossess him. And in regard to goods other than the soil, this method of juridical occupation is constantly employed and recognized to be valid. A person finds a newspaper abandoned in a railway-carriage, or catches fish at sea, or shoots wild birds, or finds diamonds in the river-bed. He annexes these things and from now on regards them as his own, nor does any one dispute his title, or deem that another could take them from him without doing him an injustice. Further, he understands, and others agree, that ownership being thus obtained, the owner's position in regard to the goods acquired is that, subject to certain limiting conditions, he may make what use of these goods he chooses. He may keep them or give them away; he may leave them as they are or seek to transform them by labour, and if the latter, do it by his own labour or by the hired labours of others. He understands too that, the things being his, are his for better or for worse. If they perish, he is the loser; if they fructify, he is the gainer. So too of their exchange-value. If purchasers present themselves, and offer a satisfactory price, it is his good fortune; if they fall off, and offer only an insufficient price, it is his ill-fortune. And they, on their side, in determining whether they will buy, and if so at what price, are not influenced by the cost of production. The seller may have spent much labour in bringing the thing into its present state, and, if he can command the market, will refuse to sell save at a price which will repay him for his labour. But the purchaser looks only to the state in which he finds the thing and at its capability of supplying his wants, natural and artificial. All this is in accordance with the theory that occupation, not labour, gives the primary title to ownership, of land as of all other external things which are subject to human ownership; and, if it is a law approved by general practice, even by the

practice of those who in theory reject it, that is its best vindication.

We are now in a better position to see into the motives which have dictated the theory of unearned increment and to judge of their character. Those who uphold this theory are clearly starting from the principle that labour bestowed is the sole title to ownership, and they have concluded that when increments of value are not due to the labour of the occupant, they are not in justice his property, but the property of the neighbour whose industry has, by supposition, created them. Their conclusion, however, falls with the invalidity of their premisses, for we have shown that labour bestowed cannot be the original title to ownership. On the other hand, since occupation is, and since ownership thus acquired carries with it as a necessary consequence that the owner gains or loses with the increase or diminution of the value of his property, what is called unearned increment is not unearned—for there is no question of earning involved—but appertains, in the same way as the corresponding decrements, to the owner for better or for worse, in virtue of the sole title of his ownership.

This is the one point we have wished to make clear in the present article, but we realize the questions which the conclusion reached may raise in the minds of some. "Is not this a doctrine which favours the children of fortune at the expense of the multitude? Does it not enable the former to exclude the latter from the means of living?" These are doubtless becoming questions to raise, but to deal with them adequately would require a whole article. Meanwhile it must suffice (1) to say that the doctrine we have been expounding is the common doctrine of the Catholic writers on ethics and natural law, and these are not the sort of people to overlook the claims of the poor; (2) to point out that according to the definition given those who have acquired by occupation or purchase a valid title to ownership are free indeed to use their property according to their wishes, but "subject to such limitations as are set by the rights of a higher order in others." Now the right to live is of a higher order than the right to hold property, and in cases of conflict the latter must give way to it. It is in this principle that the key to the difficulty must be sought, that is to say, in this principle well defined and understood.



## *A Libel on Mediæval Missions.*

---

CATHOLICS are not much interested in the discussion which has been going on in the columns of the *Church Times* as to the desirability of organizing a second Church Pageant for the summer of next year. Clearly the point is one which our Anglican friends must be left to settle among themselves, and the considerations which are likely to weigh with them in debating such a question are not for the most part considerations which would have equal weight with those who approach the history of Christianity in these islands from an entirely different point of view. None the less we may venture to express a hope that if there is to be another Pageant in the year 1910, the committee will take pains to see that the historical summaries contained in the official Handbook are subjected to some competent revision. One does not wish to use exaggerated language or to impute discreditable motives, but the plain fact remains that the Handbook of 1909 abounds in inaccuracies, to say the least, some of which are of a very regrettable kind. We have already called attention in these pages to the account given of the events which centre round the signing of Magna Charta.<sup>1</sup> In the present article we propose to deal with another and a much more inexcusable misrepresentation which comes with an especially ill grace from those who are in any way connected with the missionary organizations which the Pageant helped so largely to advertise.

But let us turn to the facts of the case. In the summary by the Rev. Percy Dearmer, which bears the title "Our Church's History as told in the scenes of the Pageant," a summary, be it noticed, which must have been read by hundreds of thousands of readers, for it was printed in the preliminary Handbook as well as in the Book of the Words—we find the following description of the closing scene :

### THE EPILOGUE

of the Pageant will introduce John and Charles Wesley and some other typical figures of their age. . . . But chiefly it will be concerned

<sup>1</sup> See the article "Obsolete History" in *THE MONTH* for June, pp. 593—604.

with the greatest revival of all—the restoration of Missionary work. For the much-despised 18th century did this great thing—it joined hands with Patrick, Ninian, David, Augustine, and Boniface. *From the 10th century to the 16th, the voice of the missionary was only heard in the Eastern Church.* We in England did almost nothing during the great controversies of the 16th and 17th; but just at the close of the latter century, Dr. Thomas Bray founded the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge; and the first year of the 18th saw the first great systematic missionary effort of the English Church. In most non-Christian countries mission work began some time during that century, and just before its close the great sister missionary society commenced its splendid career.

When we first read the words here italicized, or, to be strictly accurate, when our attention was first drawn to them by a friend, our honest impression was that the writer could not have meant them to be taken in their obvious meaning. The truth must be, we argued, that Mr. Dearmer intended to convey that in the later middle ages the field of missionary activity was transferred from the West to the East. The sentence is certainly most unfortunately worded, but the official mouthpiece of an organization whose primary task is to teach history, could not, we believed, have wished to suggest that the Roman Church from the tenth to the sixteenth century held aloof from missionary enterprise, and that the work of propagating the Christian faith was carried out exclusively by Orientals. But in this supposition we were certainly wrong. Mr. Dearmer, as we found out later, has supplied a commentary upon his own words. Almost concurrently with the appearance of the Pageant Handbook, there was published by Messrs. Mowbray, of Oxford, an expanded edition of Mr. Dearmer's summary, which bore the title, *Everyman's History of the English Church*, and which incorporated nearly all the illustrations of the Pageant Handbook. In this volume Mr. Dearmer repeats his utterance about the missions in a revised and expanded form. It will be well to reproduce the passage in full.

#### MISSIONARY WORK.

It is strange that England should have sent out no missionaries between Anglo-Saxon times and the Jacobean Era. The British Church, after producing men like Patrick, David, and Ninian, had ended in quiescence. The English Church did little after the age of St. Boniface, and from the tenth century to the sixteenth the voice of the missionary was only heard in the Eastern Church: during the

Middle Ages, when the Churches in communion with Rome seemed so strong and secure, they were making no progress, but were shrinking before the advancing hordes of Mohammedanism.<sup>1</sup> In the sixteenth century St. Francis Xavier and other Roman Catholics carried out very wonderful missionary work. But we in England did almost nothing during the horrible controversies of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.<sup>2</sup>

There is much, very much, in the setting of this passage which calls for comment, and upon which it will be necessary to say a few words later on, but let us confine ourselves first to points which are strictly matters of fact. Is it even true in the first place that English missionary enterprise stopped short with the tenth century? Nothing can more clearly indicate the existence of a dominating bias than the ungenerous way in which Mr. Dearmer avails himself of every economy which the use of round numbers can put within his reach. Looking only to British efforts, the Anglo-Saxon and Irish evangelists were active not only down to the very end of the tenth century, but throughout the eleventh and even well into the twelfth. The story of the conversion and ecclesiastical organization of Norway has not long since been told for English readers by Mr. T. B. Willson,<sup>3</sup> who bases his account upon the most scholarly Scandinavian histories which have appeared in recent years. It seems to be practically undisputed that the final conversion of the country did not take place before the reign of St. Olaf, King and martyr (c. 1015—1030). Olaf himself had spent much of his youth in England. He had come to it a pagan and left it a Christian. His biographer, the great Archbishop Eystein, declares that "when he had learned the truth of the Gospel in England, he confessed the faith with all his heart, and with zealous devotion of mind

<sup>1</sup> To the word Mohammedanism Mr. Dearmer appends this footnote. "Mahomet was founding his religion at the very time when St. Augustine landed in England in 597. In 1453 the Turks conquered the chief city of Eastern Christendom, Constantinople, and have held it ever since. Spain was a Mohammedan country from 711 till 1492—a strange fact to remember." Certainly this would be a very strange fact to remember, if the statement were interpreted according to its obvious meaning. There was only a very short period during which less than one-third of the soil of the Iberian peninsula was in Christian hands, and from the beginning of the thirteenth century onwards the Moors were masters of hardly a quarter of the whole territory. Mr. Dearmer apparently considers the persistence of Mohammedanism in Spain a reflexion upon the missionaries. We wonder how much progress has been made with the conversion of the Mohammedans in India under British rule; though power, money, and prestige are now all on the side of the missionaries.

<sup>2</sup> *Everyman's History of the English Church*, p. 140.

<sup>3</sup> *History of the Church and State in Norway from the Tenth to the Sixteenth Century*. By T. B. Willson, M.A., London, 1903.

hastened to seek the grace of baptism in the city of Rouen," while corroborative testimony to the same effect is available from other sources. But what is more directly to our purpose, we are told :

Olaf's chief advisers in all ecclesiastical matters were Bishops Grimkell and Sigurd, and along with them there were, of course, priests. Of their names we have no very certain knowledge, though two, Rudolf and Bernhard, are mentioned, but it is probable that Iceland, and not Norway, was the scene of their labours. There seems no doubt whatever that both Grimkell and Sigurd belonged to the English Church, and were Englishmen either by birth or bringing up. In any case, their connection and inclinations lay in the way of Anglo-Saxon and not German Christianity. In England, at that time, there were, of course, a large number of clergy of Norse extraction, and naturally Olaf would have selected them to accompany him to Norway, on account of their knowledge of the language and customs of the Northmen. Political reasons also, at the time of Olaf's adventurous journey to Norway, would have prevented his applying to Bremen, the metropolitan See of the north of Europe, for it was in close connection with Denmark, where Knut the Great ruled, whose authority over Norway, Olaf went to dispute.<sup>1</sup>

One thing is clear that as St. Olaf was a layman, he cannot have dispensed with the services of priests and Bishops, while all the indications supplied by the sagas and chronicles, as well as those furnished by the terminology and institutions of the Norwegian Church at a later date, point unmistakably to England as the source from which the Christianizing influences were immediately derived.<sup>2</sup> The chronicler, Adam of Bremen, who lived at the end of the eleventh century, and who was no great friend to the English, says also explicitly that St. Olaf

had with him many priests and Bishops from England, by whose admonition and doctrine he himself prepared his heart for God, and instructed his people to be guided by them. Amongst these Sigafrid, Grimkell, Rudolf, and Bernhard were renowned for their learning and virtues.<sup>3</sup>

There is apparently some reason to think that Rudolf returned to England in 1050, and became Abbot of Abingdon.

In the face of this clear evidence for the eleventh century it would seem that Mr. Dearmer has certainly been over-eager

<sup>1</sup> Willson, *Norway*, p. 70.

<sup>2</sup> See Taranger, *Den angelsaksiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den Norske*, and cf. K. Maurer, *Die Bekehrung des Norwegischen Stammes*, ii. 565.

<sup>3</sup> Adam of Bremen, Book II. cap. 55.

to close the roll of English missionaries, and has dated the cessation of their activity at least a hundred years too early. But even in St. Anselm's time missionaries for Scandinavia seem still to have been sought from England.<sup>1</sup> No doubt our records are such that in many cases it is a little difficult to disentangle legend from history, but upon such a point we may surely have recourse to the great Protestant *Realencyclopädie*, edited in its third edition by Professor Hauck of Leipzig, as to an authority which is not likely to be biassed in favour either of England or of Catholicism. Thus the writer of the article *Schweden*, published as recently as 1906, divides his outline of Swedish ecclesiastical history into three periods, of which he makes the first or missionary period extend from 830 to 1130.<sup>2</sup> The conversion of the country in its remoter districts was finally effected, according to him, by three priests named David, Eskil, and Botvid, all of whom were either Englishmen, or at least educated in England. The words with which he concludes this division of his subject runs as follows:

This English missionary enterprize finally laid low the power of the old pagan deities even in Uppland, where Sigtuna now comes into notice as an episcopal see. About the year 1130 Sweden may be regarded as a land converted to Christianity. The missionary period was now at an end.<sup>3</sup>

So much for England's immediate share in the work of preaching the Gospel. With the conversion of Scandinavia all the lands with which Englishmen were directly brought into contact had now embraced Christianity, and it seems to us perfectly natural and intelligible that the English Church should concern itself little with those distant inhabitants of Asia and Africa of whom only the vaguest rumours had then reached Western Europe. So far as the men of the twelfth century did look beyond the confines of Christendom they saw only the threatening hordes of Islam, upon whom they judged, rightly or wrongly, that the pacific arts of the missionary were powerless to make any impression. It became a first principle with the earnest Christians of that age that the followers of

<sup>1</sup> Willson, *Norway*, p. 69.

<sup>2</sup> In Herder's *Konversationslexikon* (1907, vol. vii. p. 1397) the writer gives 1160 as the date of the final Christianizing of Sweden.

<sup>3</sup> Hjalmar Holmquist in the *Realencyclopädie für Protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, vol. xviii. p. 20. Leipzig, 1906.

the Prophet must be overthrown by force of arms before they could be persuaded even to tolerate the name of Christ. The same zeal which had formerly sent men to preach the Gospel to the heathen in the unexplored tracts of northern and central Europe, now led them to brave the hardships of a military campaign two thousand miles from home on the torrid strands of Palestine and Egypt. The work was less edifying, the results were less happy, but the same spirit of generous self-sacrifice in the cause of Christ inspired both the one movement and the other. Moreover, as long as heathen peoples remained unconverted who allowed themselves to be approached, the work of the missionaries went on unabated, and it would seem that in nearly every case it was just that Christian country which was brought into most immediate contact with the pagans and which was best acquainted with their spiritual needs, which supplied an abundance of devoted men to undertake the task of conversion. When Mr. Dearmer calmly talks of missionary effort coming to an end in Europe in the tenth century, we can only remain astounded at the extraordinary insularity—we are not sure that we ought not to use a stronger word—which can allow such wild generalizations to be placed on record in an official handbook. A very simple illustration will suffice to bring home the extravagance of the assertion to which Mr. Dearmer has committed himself. We have lying before us the fourth volume of the Church History of Germany (*Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*) of Professor Albert Hauck. Professor Hauck, who is the editor, as already mentioned, of the newly-completed third edition of the Protestant *Realencyclopädie*, enjoys among his own countrymen and co-religionists an authority hardly inferior to that which attaches in England to the utterances of the late Bishop Stubbs. Now, in this fourth volume of his History Professor Hauck deals with the period from 1122 to 1250. He begins, that is, at least 122 years after the date when according to Mr. Dearmer the voice of the missionary had ceased to be heard in the Western Church. Will it be believed that of the 900 pages in Hauck's volume more than 100 are occupied by a chapter devoted to the missionary efforts made by the churches of Germany for the conversion of Pomerania, Livonia, and the other Baltic provinces? We are not by any means always prepared to endorse Hauck's manner of presenting the facts, but to maintain in the face of his elaborate narrative, documented at every point, and proving equally at every point

the keen interest taken in the work by such Pontiffs as Innocent III. and Honorius III., that the Roman Church after the tenth century had ceased to interest herself in the conversion of the heathen, would be as preposterous as to pretend that the Crusades had come to an end after the return from captivity of Richard Cœur de Lion. Of Blessed Albert of Appeldern, Bishop of Livonia, for example, Hauck says:

Bishop Albert died on January 17, 1229. He was the last great missionary Bishop of Germany. Courageously and warily had he laboured amid very difficult surroundings, and he had accomplished what falls only to the lot of the great, a work which endured through the centuries.<sup>1</sup>

In Finland again, according to J. A. Cederberg, the author of the article on the Church of Finland in the same Protestant Encyclopædia from which we have already quoted, the missionary period must be extended even later than in Livonia. "The interval between 1157 and 1300," he says, "must be regarded as the age of the missionary pioneer, so far as regards the Church history of Finland." Down to the latter date it was commonly said of the episcopal office in that country that "*episcopus in Finlandia non ad honorem assumptus sed expositus martyrio reputatur*."<sup>2</sup> Moreover, it is noteworthy that the ecclesiastic who is generally honoured with the title of "Apostle of Finland," to wit, St. Henry, Bishop of Upsala, and Martyr, is declared to have been an Englishman. No doubt it must be admitted, that legend is apt to play a disproportionate part in all these traditions, but the writer of the authoritative article we refer to is inclined to think that in its broader outlines the story of St. Eric, King of Sweden, and of St. Henry, his Bishop, is to be accounted a true one.<sup>3</sup>

We have already seen enough, it might be reasonably thought, to justify a certain honest indignation at Mr. Dearmer's indictment of the apathy of the Middle Ages, when, as he tells us, evidently with intention, "the Churches in com-

<sup>1</sup> Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, vol. iv. p. 639.

<sup>2</sup> "In Finland a Bishop is not regarded as one raised to a dignity, but set aside for martyrdom."

<sup>3</sup> A short Life of St. Henry is printed in the *Acta Sanctorum* for January 19th. In this St. Henry is expressly declared to be *ex Anglia oriundus*. Moreover, he seems to have been consecrated Bishop (c. 1148) by Cardinal Nicholas Breakspere, afterwards Pope Adrian IV. Magnus, the historian of the Bishops of Upsala, describes him as having quitted England *pro lucrands Christo animabus*.



munion with Rome seemed so strong and so secure."<sup>1</sup> But we are still far from coming to the end of our protest. We really have not met with anything for years past which seems to us more discreditable in one who professes to write history for his less instructed fellow-Anglicans than the complete ignoring of the heroic missionary work performed by the Mendicant Friars. As already stated above, our first impression on reading in the Pageant Handbook "that the voice of the missionary was only heard in the Eastern Church" was to suppose that some curious Anglican theory of national jurisdiction had led Mr. Dearmer to regard any efforts to preach the Gospel in the Far East as belonging in some obscure way to Oriental Christendom. But the rebuke administered to "the Churches in communion with Rome" renders that view impossible. Hence it is clear that Mr. Dearmer has never even heard of any such mediæval missions as those of the Franciscans in China, and we must be allowed to refer him for a few simple facts to at least one accessible book, *Cathay and the Way thither*, by Sir Henry Yule, again a writer who has no interest in exaggerating the services rendered to religion by the Church Catholic and Roman. Speaking of the return of Marco Polo with his two uncles to Venice in the year 1295 Sir Henry Yule says:

Just as the three Poli were reaching their native city, the forerunner of a new band of travellers was entering Southern China. This was John of Monte Corvino, a Franciscan monk, who already fifty years of age, was plunging alone into that great ocean of paganism, and of what he deemed little better, Nestorianism, to preach the Gospel. After years of uphill work and solitary labour others joined him; the Papal See woke up to what was going on; it made him archbishop in Khanbalig or Peking, with patriarchal authority, and sent him spasmodically batches of suffragan bishops and friars of his Order. The Roman Church spread; churches and Minorite houses were established at Khanbalig, at Zayton or Chincheu, at Yangcheu and elsewhere; and the missions flourished under the immediate patronage of the Great Khan himself. Among the friars whose duty carried them to Cathay during the interval between the beginning of the century and the year 1328, when the Archbishop John was followed to the grave by mourn-

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Dearmer of course wishes to contrast this slackness of the Church of Rome at a time of peace and power, with the position of the Church of England, which only lacked the missionary spirit for a brief interval when it was racked "by the horrible controversies of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries." See our quotation from *Everyman's History of the English Church*, p. 294, above.

ing multitudes, Pagan as well as Christian, several have left letters or more extended accounts of their experiences in Cathay.<sup>1</sup>

Sir Henry Yule then specifies a number of these writers, *e.g.*, John de Cora, Archbishop of Sultania, Andrew of Perugia, Bishop of Zayton, &c., and he adds:

The only ecclesiastical narrative subsequent to the time of Archbishop John is that contained in the reminiscences of John Marignolli, who spent four years at the court of Peking (1342—1346) as Legate from the Pope.<sup>2</sup>

It is true that this thriving mission was overthrown with the downfall of the Mongols, but even so the cause was not given up without a struggle.

As regards Christian intercourse [with China] missions and merchants alike disappear from the field soon after the middle of the fourteenth century, as the Mongol dynasty totters and comes down. We hear, indeed, once and again of friars despatched from Avignon [then the residence of the Popes], but they go forth into the darkness and are heard of no more.<sup>3</sup>

But in any case it must not be supposed from the toleration extended to the missionaries by the Mongolian Government that the preaching of the Gospel in these remote regions was an undertaking free from danger. The very perils of the journey were such as might have daunted the stoutest heart, and over and over again we know that the crown of martyrdom was the reward of the missionary's daring. In 1339, as Yule again tells us, "we find William of Modena, a merchant, dying for the faith with certain friars at Almalik on the banks of the Ili." Similarly, under the year 1362 Wadding records that "Friar James of Florence, Archbishop of Zayton, and Friar William the Campanian, two Minorites, were slain as Christian confessors in the empire of the Medes." This last expression, as Yule shows, refers really to the middle empire of the Tartars.<sup>4</sup> Neither were the Franciscans the only missionaries in that region of the extreme East. The same authority, in another part of his *Cathay*,<sup>5</sup> translates the letter of one, Brother Menentillus, a Dominican, who at the beginning of the fourteenth century had clearly traversed a great part of Central Asia.

<sup>1</sup> *Cathay and the Way thither*, vol. i. p. cxxxii.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* i. p. cxxxiv.

<sup>4</sup> *Loc. cit.* p. cxxxiv.

<sup>5</sup> Vol. i. pp. 209—218.

These were not days however when missionaries wrote home by every mail, and had competent salaries or pensions paid them regularly in quarterly instalments. There must have been hundreds and thousands of whom no memory survives, and any one who wishes to form an idea of the work performed, or at least attempted, must seek his information from out-of-the-way sources, and notably from the chronicles of the various Religious Orders. If we appeal to such an authority as Sir Henry Yule, it is only because the most resolute opponent of monkery cannot waive his statements aside as unveracious and prejudiced. But Sir Henry only lifts a corner of the veil. While he tells us parenthetically how

the fact has been generally overlooked and forgotten that for many years in the course of the fourteenth century, not only were missionaries of the Roman Church and Houses of the Franciscan Order established in the chief cities of China, but a regular trade was carried on overland between Italy and China by way of Tana (or Azov), Astracan, Otrar and Kamul,<sup>1</sup>

he also indirectly confirms the claim of the Mendicant Orders to a far wider sphere of missionary activity. Even in his own pages we hear of other establishments founded by the friars at Ukek, Sarai and Menjar in the Volga region.<sup>2</sup> But if any honest Anglican really wishes to form an idea of what the Roman Church was doing for the conversion of the heathen in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, he must go to some such work as Wadding's *Annales Minorum*, or at least to the convenient summary of Franciscan history recently compiled by Father Holzapfel.<sup>3</sup>

It would be impossible to find room here for any systematic account of the labours of the friars. In every part of the then known world their activity was felt. In Europe they at once set to work to preach the Gospel in all those outlying regions which as yet had not received, or only imperfectly received, a knowledge of the Christian faith. They were scattered all over the Balkan peninsula. They entered Albania and Montenegro as early as 1240, and they were still there in the fifteenth century. In the time of Nicholas IV. (1288—1292) they began to evangelize Bosnia, but in 1372 we find Gregory XI. urging that still more Franciscan missionaries should be sent thither,

<sup>1</sup> *Marco Polo*, i. p. clviii.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* i. pp. 5, 8; ii. p. 422.

<sup>3</sup> Holzapfel, *Manuale Historiae Ordinis Fratrum Minorum*, Freiburg, 1909, pp. 217—239.

and Pope Eugenius IV., in the next century, describes them in this region as "a firm bulwark of the house of God and an outpost for the propagation of the orthodox faith."<sup>1</sup> In Servia and Bulgaria we read just the same history. At every difficulty the Popes turn to the friars, and the friars never fail to respond to the call. The King of Hungary, in 1367, asked the General of the Franciscans to send 2,000 missionaries to Bulgaria, and it would seem that those who actually obeyed the summons were numbered by hundreds. In the more northern regions of Wallachia, Moldavia, and Lithuania,<sup>2</sup> the same activity was displayed. In 1325, thirty-six Franciscans were put to death by the pagans at Wilna, while at the end of the fifteenth century the same devoted Religious were preaching the Gospel in Lapland.

In Africa, again, the same story repeats itself with almost monotonous uniformity. The famous Raymund Lull, the *Doctor illuminatus*, who died a martyr at Bougia, in Tunis, in 1315, and is now beatified, was only one of an immense band of missionaries who during the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries never ceased in their efforts to secure a foothold in Morocco, Tunis, Algiers, Lybia, Egypt, and Abyssinia. As soon as ever the Portuguese navigators began to open up the western coast of the Dark Continent, the missionary friars at once followed in their train. The Observant lay-Brother, St. Diego, canonized by Sixtus V., spent several years in the Canaries, where the friars had many Houses, and it was the disappointment of his life that in his efforts to convert the pagan natives he had not found a martyr's crown. On the coast of Guinea, Alphonsus Bolano began his missionary labours in 1459, and in 1472 he was appointed Prefect Apostolic of the whole region. From this centre the friars made their way southwards to the mouth of the Congo, and there they had formed a most flourishing missionary settlement before the end of the fifteenth century. Again, when Vasco da Gama doubled the Cape of Good Hope the Franciscans at once followed in his wake, and in the year 1500 eight of them began their labours in the newly-discovered territory of Mozambique.

As for Asia, we have already said enough to serve our

<sup>1</sup> Holzapfel, p. 218.

<sup>2</sup> How utterly untrue the suggestion is that the initiative of these missionary efforts rested with others, and that the Papacy took no interest in them, may be gathered from the documents published by A. Theiner in his various *Monumenta*.

present purpose. We will only add that hardly any part of the Continent seems to have lain altogether beyond the range of the missionary enterprize of the friars. The Dominicans laboured in Persia as earnestly as the Franciscans in Tartary, while Georgia and Hindustan, Armenia and Syria were all at various times watered by the blood of Christian martyrs.

In the presence of facts like these—and we have hardly done more than indicate in the faintest outline the activity of a single Order, though the Dominicans, Augustinians, and others also loyally did their share—what becomes of Mr. Percy Dearmer's astounding assertion that for six hundred years in the Roman Church at the time of her greatest prosperity and security the missionary spirit was dead?

Possibly when other defence fails it may occur to Mr. Dearmer or those who sympathize with him, to throw discredit upon the records to which we have appealed, and to declare that the stories of Franciscan enterprize detailed in Wadding and similar Annals represent only the inventions, or at best the gross exaggerations, of unscrupulous friars, eager to outstrip the claims of their Dominican or Augustinian rivals. But we have surely some evidence that these things were not mere dreams. When Columbus and his emulators revealed the existence of a new and vast continent beyond the western ocean, religion in Europe, so we have been told a thousand times, was at its lowest ebb. The "glorious Reformation" which was to purify the Church from its corruptions was already knocking at the gates, but even in Germany those who believe in the vivifying influence of the teaching of Luther and Calvin, will not pretend that the leaven had produced any appreciable effect upon the religious spirit at large before 1535 or 1540. It was not till then that the Jesuit Order was founded or the work of the Counter-Reformation began. None the less, extraordinary to say, when the New World was discovered, that missionary spirit which according to Mr. Dearmer had been dead for six hundred years suddenly woke into life in this hour of the deepest degradation of the Roman Church, woke indeed into a most vigorous life and without any assignable cause. Is this view, which supposes all zeal for souls extinguished in the West, consistent or even conceivable?

Whatever may be thought of the comparatively obscure labours of isolated bands of friars in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries, the facts regarding the evangelization of

the American continent in the early years of the sixteenth century are too well attested to be for a moment in doubt. There is no nobler page in the history of the Church than the story of the work of the Spanish missionaries, and primarily the Dominicans, who went forth to become the teachers and the champions of the natives in these newly-discovered western lands. No one who has read the facts as they are recorded in such a work as Helps' *Spanish Conquest of America*, or the same writer's *Life of Las Casas*, can ever forget the heroic example of courage and self-sacrifice set by the friars in that age of corruption, lawlessness, and greed. Neither was this the work of a few individuals who stood apart from their fellows. Sir Arthur Helps, after telling how the first Dominican missionaries died off in New Spain, speaks with deep respect of the enthusiasm which prevailed amongst their brethren in Europe, and the eagerness to supply their places. He quotes with approval the words of Remesal :

With the news that came every day to Spain of the many nations of those parts, and how new ones were continually being discovered, the Lord disposed the minds of many saintly men belonging to the glorious Order of St. Dominic that they should freely offer themselves to leave their native towns, provinces, and religious homes, to go to the Indies to preach. . . . These good and worthy desires seized grave and elderly fathers of wisdom and prudence, old in the practice of the honourable offices of the Divine Service, revered in their communities, punctual in the choir, constant in prayer, learned men, masters in theology and examples to youth, because at first only men of this kind went to the Indies.<sup>1</sup>

Of the many who offered themselves in 1528, forty were chosen, and more than twenty of these set sail together to start a mission on the coast of Venezuela. Sir Arthur Helps, and not only he, but all the historians who have dealt with this period, speak in general in terms of the warmest appreciation of the courage, the self-sacrifice and the devotedness of the numberless bands of friars who went out from Spain, attracted by no earthly reward, but only intent upon extending the kingdom of God. Sir Arthur in one passage compares their solicitude for the souls of the poor Indians, to the instinct of a mother ready to sacrifice all for her child.

It is a bold figure [he says] to illustrate the feelings of a monk by those of a mother, but it may be doubted whether many mothers have

<sup>1</sup> Helps, *Spanish Conquest*, iii. p. 204.

suffered a keener agony of apprehensive expectation than Las Casas and his brethren endured at this and other points of their career. They had the fullest faith in God and the utmost reliance upon Him; but they knew that He acts through secondary means, and how easily, they doubtless thought, might some failure in their own preparation—some unworthiness in themselves—some unfortunate conjunction of political affairs in the Indies—some dreadful wile of the Evil One—frustrate all their long enduring hopes. In an age when private and individual success is made too much of and success for others too little, it may be difficult for many persons to imagine the intense interest with which these childless men looked forward to the realization of their great religious enterprize—the bringing of the Indians by peaceful means into the fold of Christ.<sup>1</sup>

These are the impressions of an honest Protestant who had thoroughly studied at first-hand the writings of Las Casas and his contemporaries. And indeed when we realize how great were the hardships of the voyage across the Atlantic, how mortified and laborious the life led by the missionaries when they had reached their goal, and how acute the conflict between the Spanish slave-owners and the poor Religious who championed the cause of the natives, it is inconceivable that any motive but the highest can have led such numbers of the friars to offer themselves for a work which had no attractions for flesh and blood. If this self-sacrifice was possible in the sixteenth century, it was surely both possible and probable in the fourteenth, when the Mendicant Orders were nearer by two hundred years to the time of their first fervour.

And this brings us to the most extraordinary part of Mr. Dearmer's conception of mediæval Christendom. "It is strange," he remarks, as quoted above, "that England should have sent out no missionaries between Anglo-Saxon times and the Jacobean Era." "Jacobean Era!" we might echo, but let that pass. Again, the assumption that no Englishmen went out as missionaries is in point of fact not true, but let that also pass.<sup>2</sup> The fundamental misrepresentation lies in this that the mediæval English Church is put before us as failing in the discharge of an obvious duty to the heathen, a duty as obvious

<sup>1</sup> *Spanish Conquest*, iii. 229, 230.

<sup>2</sup> We wonder how many missionaries the Established Church had sent out before the end of the Jacobean Era; and we wonder how many of English birth and education were sent out *to preach to the heathen* even during the Georgian period. During the eighteenth century ninety per cent. of the "missionaries," as the S.P.G. Reports show, went to the English colonies and spent their energies upon the colonists themselves.



as that which weighs upon our modern England with its Indian Empire and a vast native population in its colonial settlements. Has it ever occurred to Mr. Dearmer that for Englishmen "from the 10th century to the 16th" there were practically no heathen, no field at all for missionary enterprise? All the peoples with whom England was in contact, except, as already mentioned, in the extreme north of Europe, and except again the Mohammedan races, who offered no alternative but the sword, were already converted to Christ. Mr. Dearmer speaks as if the intending evangelist in order to find pagans had only to take the next steamer to Bombay or the train to Constantinople. But the moment that new countries were discovered, and new fields of missionary activity opened up, the Religious Orders pressed forward without stint or stay to preach the Gospel, and to bring spiritual and temporal succour to the poor heathen, sacrificing all things to gain souls to Christ. We believe ourselves justified in regarding the missionary zeal displayed in the evangelization of America during the decadent sixteenth century, as perhaps the most striking proof which exists, that even at the very worst of times the vital energy of the Church, Catholic and Roman, has never suffered eclipse.

With such a record, then, before us as the mediæval annals of the Mendicant Orders—we need say nothing here of the Society of Jesus and other more recent organizations—it is a little difficult to be patient with the smug contentment of a writer like Mr. Dearmer, who, with a stroke of the pen, blots out six centuries of heroic zeal and devotion, in order to throw into higher relief the salaried triumphs of the S.P.G. and C.M.S. We confess that we do not think much of the English missions of "Jacobean" or Georgian days, though we regard with sincere respect the many earnest Anglicans who in recent years have gone out to do missionary work far from their native land. But even taking Anglican effort at its highest and its best, we must beg leave to doubt if all that has been accomplished by the English Church since the S.P.G. was founded, can bear comparison with the work of the mediæval friars during any single ten years of those long centuries in which Mr. Dearmer finds it convenient to assume that "the voice of the missionary was only heard in the Eastern Church."

HERBERT THURSTON.

## *Flotsam and Jetsam.*

### **Queen Elizabeth and the Mass.**

THE Rev. Sabine Baring-Gould, M.A., at p. 652 of his *Cornish Characters*, lately published, writes: "During the first years of Elizabeth there had been no persecution of the Papists. Such as would not conform to the Church of England as reformed were allowed to have priests to say Mass in their own private chapels." Mr. Baring-Gould evidently considers as beneath notice such Catholics as were not rich enough to have private chapels, but, passing this by, it is surprising that any educated man should think that rich Catholics with private chapels were allowed to use them until St. Pius V. published the Bull of April 27, 1570.

On April 28, 1559, the Uniformity Bill

"was read for the third time in the Lords. It was brought to the vote. In a House which probably did not exceed fifty members present, and by the narrow majority of three, the old Latin Service was abolished, and the Elizabethan Prayer-Book was to take its place. Not a single spiritual lord voted for it, and this anomaly is still inscribed upon the Act,"<sup>1</sup>

which on May 8th received the formal assent of the Queen. From the first the Act was regarded as having utterly prohibited the Mass, and was so interpreted in the royal proclamation issued soon afterwards. At the end of the month Grindal, referring to this proclamation, writes to the foreign Protestant, Hubert, "no one after the feast of St. John the Baptist next ensuing may celebrate Mass without subjecting himself to a most heavy penalty."<sup>2</sup> In January, 1559-60, we find one Pacquet, a Jersey priest, imprisoned in Castle Cornet, Guernsey, for saying Masses and administering the sacraments.<sup>3</sup> On April 8, 1561, Dr. John Ramridge, formerly Archdeacon of Derby, who had been deprived of his archdeaconry and other preferments for refusing to take the Oath of Supremacy, said Mass in Sir Edward Waldegrave's house at Borley, in Essex, in

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Henry Gee, *Elizabethan Prayer-Book and Ornaments*, p. 102.

<sup>2</sup> Parker Society, *Zurich Letters*, ii. no. 8.

<sup>3</sup> *Calendar of State Papers*, Dom. Add. 1547-1565, p. 499.

the presence of Sir Edward Waldegrave and his wife, Frances, daughter of Sir Edward Neville, his sister Anne, his servants, Thomas Wyborde and Edmund Clerke, and his falconer, William Alwyn, *alias* Stephen, and others. For this Sir Edward and Lady Waldegrave and the Archdeacon were committed to the Tower a few days later, April 20th. On June 3rd in the same year they were indicted before the Earl of Oxford and other commissioners of oyer and terminer at Brentwood in Essex, and the indictment was as follows: <sup>1</sup>

*S. Essex. The jurors present for our lady the queen, that John R., late of London, clerk, on the 8th day of April in the 3rd year, etc., at B. in the county of Essex, voluntarily said, used and celebrated one private Mass, against the form of a certain statute in a parliament begun and holden at Westminster on the 23rd day of January in the reign of our said lady the now queen, and then and there prorogued until the 25th day of the same month, and then continued from the same 25th day of January to and until the 8th day of May then next following, made and provided, and against the peace of the queen her crown and dignity. And that E.W. of B. aforesaid, in the county aforesaid, knight, F. and others, on the said 8th day of April at B. aforesaid, at the time of the celebration of the Mass aforesaid, were present hearing the aforesaid Mass, and maintaining and comforting the said J. R. the Mass aforesaid to say and celebrate against the form of the statute aforesaid, and against the peace, etc.*

The first point taken for the defence was that there was no such Act of Parliament, because in fact Parliament was not begun before the 25th day of January. This was held good. The second point was "whether every priest who is not a parson, vicar, or stipendiary chaplain, nor obliged or bounden by his cure to serve, &c., is within the purview of the said statute." This was much debated, but at length all the commissioners except one came to the conclusion that he is. In the event Ramridge was condemned, and all three prisoners were sent back to the Tower. At the next sessions, the first point being disposed of by an information laid by the Attorney-General, Sir Edward and Lady Waldegrave were condemned to forfeit one hundred marks, or be imprisoned six months. Sir Edward died in the Tower, September 1, 1561, long before the six months had expired, and the point was raised whether the forfeiture did, or did not, remain, though it is not clear how the question was decided.<sup>2</sup> It is also not at all clear how it was that the first point taken did not cover Ramridge as well as the Waldegraves.

<sup>1</sup> Dyer, 203 a. ; Catholic Record Society, i. 51, 55.

<sup>2</sup> Dyer, 203 b., 231 b.

There must be some error in the report. Probably the same mistake as to the date of the beginning of Parliament vitiated the indictments of eleven other persons who were tried at the Essex assizes on the same day. These were Sir Thomas Wharton, Knight, afterwards second Baron Wharton; the Lady Anne, his wife, daughter of Robert, first Earl of Sussex; Elizabeth Gaywood, wife of Mr. Gaywood of Maldon; Elizabeth Worlington; Margaret Williams; Margaret Felton, wife of George Felton; Anne Waldegrave, Thomas Wyborde, and Edward Clerke, above mentioned; Margery, a nun; and Elizabeth, Lady Hubblethorne, second wife and relict of Sir Henry Hubblethorne, Lord Mayor of London in 1546-7. Ten persons then indicted received sentence. These were George Felton; Thomas Large, who had heard Mass in Sir Thomas Wharton's house at Boreham, in Essex; Robert Dampont; John Sherman, *alias* Hunt, who no doubt was the person who held the Vicarage of Bentley Magna from 1541 to 1557, and the Vicarage of Bulmer from 1556 to 1561; William Alwyn, above mentioned; William Jolly, Sir Thomas Wharton's chaplain, formerly Vicar of Pentlow from 1543 to 1560; Nicholas Bush, Jolly's successor at Pentlow; John Ramridge, above mentioned; Robert Downes; and Godfrey Barlow.<sup>1</sup>

Other notable prisoners for the Mass about this time were Edward Lord Hastings, of Loughborough, who for hearing Mass at Newhall was relegated to the custody of the Earl of Pembroke, April 20, 1561, from which he was transferred to that of Sir Richard Sackville; the well-known physician, John Fryer, sent the same day, or three days later, to the Tower; Arthur Pole, the future conspirator, sent the same day to the Fleet; Sir John Mordaunt, second Baron Mordaunt of Turvey, to the Fleet; and Sir Thomas Stradling, of St. Donat's, Glamorganshire, sent to the Tower, May 28, 1561.<sup>2</sup>

Dr. Sander, after mentioning eight of the above by name, says that at this time there were in addition ten students of civil law, and 160 of the common people in prison for hearing Mass.<sup>3</sup> Among the priests arrested about this time were Langdon, a monk of Westminster, who soon after managed to escape into Flanders; Richard Robson, parson, of Cavendish, Suffolk:<sup>4</sup> John Coxe, *alias* Devon, who had said Mass at Sir

<sup>1</sup> Catholic Record Society, i. 51.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* i. 50-52, 55; *Calendar of State Papers*, Dom. Add. 1547-1565, 510.

<sup>3</sup> Catholic Record Society, i. 45.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* i. 50, 52.

Thomas Wharton's house at Newhall, Essex, at Sir Edward Waldegrave's house at Borley, and at Christopher Stubbs's house in Westminster, and was sent to the Marshalsea April 15, 1561,<sup>1</sup> and Alan Chinnery, sent to the same prison five days later.<sup>2</sup> Another priest, apprehended later, was Thomas Haverde, LL.B., who had been presented to the vicarage of Llandilo Vawr, Carmarthenshire, in 1534, and deprived in 1559. He was arrested September 8, 1562, while he was saying Mass in Lady Carew's house in Fetter Lane, and taken before the Lord Mayor, who committed him to the Counter in Wood Street, and the next day, Thursday the 9th, he was removed to the Marshalsea.<sup>3</sup> On the 13th, Grindal and Cox write to the Lords of the Council that they had examined the priest and his congregation on the 10th, but that "neyther the Prieste nor anye of his Auditours, nott so moche as the Kitchin Mayde, will receive any Othe before us, to answer to Articles, butt stoutlie saye they will nott sweare; and saye also that they will neyther accuse themselves nor none other," and they end with this suggestion: "Some thinke that if this Prieste haverd might be put to some kynde of Torment, and so driven to confesse what he knowethe, he might gayne the Quene's Majestie a good Masse of Monye by the Masses that he hath sayd."<sup>4</sup> Lady Carew, whom I have not been able to identify, was sent to the Fleet.<sup>5</sup> Haverde, before his arrest, had been with his relatives in Herefordshire. He is described in a list of recusants "as late chaplain to Mrs. Clarencieux,"<sup>6</sup> i.e., Queen Mary's favourite lady-in-waiting, Susan, daughter of Richard White, of Hutton, Essex, and widow of Thomas Tonge, Clarencieux King of Arms.<sup>7</sup> Probably Haverde, is the same as the Thomas Heyward arrested for saying Mass at Lady Browne's house in Cow Lane on Palm Sunday, April 4, 1574, as Stowe relates. This priest was released on the following August 26th.<sup>8</sup>

On February 7, 1567, Giovanni Correr, the Venetian Ambassador in France, wrote to the Signory, that it was reported that in England Mass was being said publicly, and numerous

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* i. 51, 52. *Calendar of State Papers*, Dom. 1547—1580, pp. 173, 174.

<sup>2</sup> Catholic Record Society, i. 50, 51, 53. <sup>3</sup> *Machyn's Diary*, pp. 291, 292.

<sup>4</sup> Haynes, *Burghley State Papers*, pp. 395, 396.

<sup>5</sup> Catholic Record Society, i. 49.

<sup>6</sup> *Calendar of State Papers*, Add. 1547—1565, p. 524.

<sup>7</sup> Madden, *Privy Purse Expenses of Princess Mary*, p. 222.

<sup>8</sup> Dasent, *Acts of the Privy Council*, viii. 287.

attended ; and that, the priest who was inspired by God to celebrate Mass in public not being impeded, many others had followed his example without hindrance.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, two gentlemen who heard Mass at Easter in that year (March 30th) were sent to the Fleet, and another gentleman was sent there for the same offence on the 15th of May.<sup>2</sup> On December 1, Don Diego Guzman de Silva, the Spanish Ambassador, reports that a considerable number of English people who heard Mass in his house had been summoned by the Queen's Commissioners, and that being asked to take oath that they would answer truly the question put to them, about six of them swore conditionally to answer according to the law, but six refused to swear, and were sent to prison.<sup>3</sup> On December 21st, he gives the number in prison as "four or five,"<sup>4</sup> and on December 29th as five.<sup>5</sup> Among these were a Mr. Pierrepont and a Mr. Mark Carrell.

On Sunday, October 24, 1568, the agents of Grindal actually entered the Portuguese Ambassador's house at Hoxton and arrested the English there, but the Ambassador, Manuel Alvarez, refused to give them up.<sup>6</sup>

Enough has been said to show that the policy of Elizabeth, her Council, her Parliaments, and her Bishops, was, from the outset, the extirpation of the Mass. "Mass-priests" and "Mass-mongers" were terms of opprobrium used of such old Henrician and Marian priests as refused to conform. "The sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were"—and still are in the official opinion of the Church of England as by law established—"blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits."<sup>7</sup> It is true that an increasing number of its adherents are of the opinion of the great lexicographer, "Sir, there is no idolatry in the Mass. They believe God to be there, and they adore Him." That, however, was not the view of Grindal<sup>8</sup> or Jewel<sup>9</sup> or Guest.<sup>10</sup> "The idolatry of the Mass" was one of the cardinal tenets of the Church of which Queen Elizabeth was Supreme Governess.

JOHN B. WAINEWRIGHT.

<sup>1</sup> *Calendar of State Papers*, Ven. 1558—1580, p. 387.

<sup>2</sup> Catholic Record Society, i. 49.

<sup>3</sup> *Calendar of State Papers*, Span. 1558—1567, p. 686.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 689. <sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 690.

<sup>6</sup> *Calendar of State Papers*, Dom. 1547—1580, p. 321. Span. 1568—1579, p. 80.

<sup>7</sup> Article xxxi. <sup>8</sup> Parker Society, *Grindal*, pp. 211, 212.

<sup>9</sup> Parker Society, *Jewel*, pp. 11, 12, 13. <sup>10</sup> *Apud* Gee, *op. cit.* p. 223.

### A bogus Protestant Martyr.

The Birmingham Art Gallery possesses a picture by a Belgian artist, Mr. Willem Geets, representing the martyrdom of a Protestant girl, Jeannette de Lanthove, buried alive for heresy at Malines (Belgium) in 1526.

Historical painting usually has a didactic purpose in view, and the public, not to speak of the artists, sometimes appreciate it more for this didactic aspect than for its artistic merits. With the artistic merits of this Birmingham picture we are not concerned at present, but from a historical standpoint it is a highly suggestive example of the method of creating a legend; indeed, as it claims to represent the death of a martyr, it might fitly be added to the collection of legends criticized by the Bollandist Father Delehay in his *Legends of the Saints*.

It instructs us that a girl named Jeannette de Lanthove was buried alive for Lutheranism at Malines in the Netherlands in 1526, and it assures us that so safe an authority as "the contemporary archives" attests the truth of the fact. Nor can it be denied that the writer of one of the chief histories of the reign of Charles V. in the Netherlands (1506-1555), A. Henne, mentions the execution of the Lutheran, Jeannette de Lanthove, in 1526, and rests his statement on what seems to be undeniable proof. It is an extract from the original accounts of the *écoutète* (mayor) of Malines, who paid the executioner for burying alive this Jeannette de Lanthove in 1526. The quotation given by Henne must be transcribed literally: "*Au bourreau, pour avoir exécuté Jannéken [Flemish for Jeannette] de Lanthove, lutérienne, la quelle fut enfouye toute vive.*" (*Compte de Jean Van der Aa . . . de 1526, f. vi. v<sup>o</sup>. No. 15666.*)<sup>1</sup>

Now this quotation is a patent fraud. It is not to be found in the archives to which Henne refers, and we might have been left to think that it sprang entirely from his brain, had it not been investigated by an industrious scholar, Professor Dr. Paul Fredericq, of Ghent University, the famous author of the *Corpus documentorum inquisitionis hereticæ pravitatis neerlandicæ*. It was found by him that the execution is indeed mentioned in the accounts of Jean Van der Aa, but for the year 1514, and that it runs as follows: "*Au bourreau, pour avoir exécuté Jannekin de Lanthove, laquelle fut enfouye tout vive pour ce païé liii f. iiiii d. par.*" (*Chambres des Comptes, No. 15666,*

<sup>1</sup> *Histoire du règne de Charles V. en Belgique*, vol. iv., pp. 317, 318. Brussels, 1885.



1514, f<sup>o</sup>. vi. v<sup>o</sup>.) Obviously, there can be no question of a Lutheran executed before Luther's revolt; so, Henne calmly *changes the date of the document* from 1514 to 1526, and *inserts in it the word "lutheran"* after the name of the girl.

Such literary dishonesty is hardly conceivable, and cannot even be explained by the evident desire of swelling the Protestant martyrology. Though not a Catholic, Dr. Fredericq has called attention to Henne's interpolation. "Whence," he says, "Henne has drawn the word 'Lutheran,' is a riddle to me. Seeing the date (1514), it is impossible to imagine this to be a case of Lutheran heresy."<sup>1</sup>

But the imposture is likely to prove more persistent than truth. It was launched by the historian, and made its way to the studio of the artist, and from there to the daily press in England. Of course, it travelled under the protecting flag of "original archives." But, in fact, the most objective of all documents—a positive bill of payment—tells us that Jeannette de Lanthove was executed in 1514; thus she could not have been martyred for her belief in 1526. Nor is there any ground for inferring that her execution in 1514 was for any religious offence. It may possibly have been, though there was no particular heresy raging in 1514 to call forth repression. But, in any case, the entry is not in the Inquisition Registers. Indeed, Henne himself testifies that the Inquisition did not commence its operations in the Netherlands till 1526. It is in the town registers, and it was therefore presumably for some civil offence that the punishment was inflicted, especially as burying alive was not a usual punishment for heresy, but was for certain civil offences.

We do not wish to be misunderstood. Of course, people were put to death for heresy in those days, or, at all events, a little later, when Protestantism did enter upon the field of history. Protestants were put to death by Catholics, and Catholics by Protestants on this kind of charge. We refer to this particular case only, as another instance of the sort of fraud whereby bogus Protestant martyrs are so often manufactured. Moreover, in referring to it, we have no thought of blaming the Committee of the Birmingham Art Gallery, though we would now suggest to them the propriety of some sort of indication that the story depicted has been tampered with. L. W.

<sup>1</sup> *Corpus document.*, part v. p. 450, Gent, 1903. That Henne is not alluding to another person with the same name, who might be mentioned in other archives, appears clearly from the number and the page of the reference.

**The Ethics of Falsification.**

It would seem that there are writers who assume that in dealing with the notorious "False Decretals," the ordinary rules of veracity have no place, and that controversialists who wish to employ this topic against the Church of Rome, so long as they avoid any statement which can be categorically shown to be a mere falsehood, are at liberty to indulge in *suppressio veri* and *suggestio falsi* to their heart's content.

Such a reflection is suggested by a recent paragraph of the "Christian and Protestant" *Vanguard*,<sup>1</sup> which is specially directed to the confusion of the Catholic Truth Society, and has been circulated by the active Secretary of The Protestant Press Bureau, calling particular attention to what he evidently considers this very telling item. *The History of the Catholic Church in England*, published by the C.T.S., having asserted that the authority of the Popes derived no confirmation from the Decretals, which, on the contrary, gained the currency and influence they enjoyed from their agreement with the existing ideas of the power of the Papacy, Mr. A. le Lièvre thus exhibits in the *Vanguard* the mendacity of such a statement.

Father L. de Régnon, a Jesuit, contributed to the organ of the French Jesuits, *Études Religieuses*, &c., for November, 1866, a remarkable essay on the False Decretals. Father de Régnon proves conclusively that the spurious documents did alter the discipline of Rome. He quotes a letter from the Pope, dated 862, and another of the year 865, the teaching of which differs. "This new discipline [says the learned Jesuit] is no doubt good. Adopted by Nicholas the Great in 865, by the Eighth Ecumenical Council in 870, confirmed by the Council of Trent in 1564, it has been for nine centuries the common law of the Catholic Church. . . . It is impossible to justify, or even to excuse, the means employed by the pseudo-Isidore to attain his end. Falsehood remains an evil, even when he who employs it means well. And the falsehood was premeditated."

The meaning which is evidently meant to be gathered from this, and which the ordinary reader will gather as a matter of course, is that in the judgment of "the learned Jesuit" (even Jesuits may be complimented when convenient), it was the Popes who employed this premeditated falsehood to bolster up their own fictitious claims. But it is dangerous in such cases to give accurate references which enable those who choose to examine the original for themselves, and whoever is able to consult the paper of Father de Régnon, will find a good deal

<sup>1</sup> August, 1909, p. 11.

there which the Protestant lover of Truth has not thought it necessary to mention.<sup>1</sup>

In the first place, the learned Jesuit does not pretend to contribute anything of his own to the discussion, but undertakes to exhibit the conclusions of a Protestant writer, Paul Hinschius, who has made an exhaustive study of the question, which appeared to Father Régnon to supersede all that had been done by previous students,<sup>2</sup> and with whose conclusions, except as to some minor and insignificant points of detail, Father de Régnon entirely agrees. In examining the result of these conclusions as set forth in the article before us, we find that the actual words undoubtedly stand as they appear in the *Vanguard*, and it is fully acknowledged that the Decretals were falsified, and the falsehood was premeditated. The guilty party, however, was *not* Pope Nicholas I.—as would naturally be supposed from what we have heard—but “Benedict the Deacon,” by whom the Pope himself was deceived, so as to write in 865, in a sense different from that in which he had written in 862—the two dates which, as will be remembered, are specially quoted by our critic.

More important still, Father de Régnon concludes his article with the following note, concerning which the Protestant lover of truth naturally enough says nothing.

We have deemed it useless directly to refute the assertions of the enemies of the Church regarding the False Decretals: the more so as we have done so in a former article contributed to this periodical in 1864.

In the said article—already referred to above—Father de Régnon thus summed up his appreciation of the merits of the work he was examining.

M. Hinschius seems to us to have above all rendered this invaluable service, that in a question which for more than three centuries has been made to serve against Rome he has placed the truth within the reach of all, whether friends or enemies, learned or unlearned. In future it will be impossible for anyone to write concerning the False Decretals without having consulted this new edition, and, having done so, no one can make an attack on Rome with any show of good faith.

Clearly in so speaking Father de Régnon forfeited all claim to be styled a “learned Jesuit,” and the assailants of the Catholic Truth Society are not in the number of those who care to have the truth on this subject made accessible to them.

J. G.

<sup>1</sup> *Études*, New Series, t. xi. pp. 382—397.

<sup>2</sup> *Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianæ, etc.* By P. Hinschius. Leipsic: Tauchnitz, 1863. *Études*, ut sup., t. v. pp. 474, &c.

**Traduttore Traditore.**

Few books have been published on the Continent of recent years which appear to us more likely to do good, and fewer still have better deserved to be presented in an attractive form to the English reader, than the critical examination of the works of Dr. H. C. Lea undertaken by the well-known Catholic scholar, P. M. Baumgarten. As every one must know who has any acquaintance with controversial literature, Dr. Lea's books have greatly helped to deepen the prejudice against Catholicism. His voluminous researches into the history of the Inquisition, his work on Auricular Confession and Indulgences, even his diatribes against Clerical Celibacy and Mediæval Superstitions, have all, no doubt, a certain value as the outcome of much diligent, if sometimes perverse, inquiry into out-of-the-way paths of learning. At the same time, it seems certain that Dr. Lea's exposition of these various subjects is largely based upon the work of paid assistants. As a mere record of facts it is therefore of very unequal value. Still more, his presentment of these delicate matters is constantly disfigured by a misunderstanding of technical details and a determined bias against the whole Catholic system. What is most dangerous of all, he possesses in a greater degree than any other writer a sort of natural audacity and bluff, calmly citing points of evidence which flatly contradict his conclusions as if they were so many obvious confirmations of his theory. Unfortunately, the subjects he deals with are commonly difficulties which Catholic apologists have too often been afraid of handling candidly and frankly. Dr. Lea has therefore been able to assume the pose of a pioneer breaking new ground, or of an ardent seeker after truth who lays bare the pretences of an obscurantist theology. Anti-clericals and Freemasons, both at home and abroad, have welcomed his indictments with acclaim, and now we see Dr. Lea, despite his really portentous blunders and his many inconsistencies, accepted as a serious authority upon the Catholic practice of past ages, and quoted as a historian with whom no Papal apologist dares to cross swords. Under these circumstances, a book which in the compass of a couple of hundred pages, not too crowded with technical details, should prick this bubble reputation, was very much to be desired, and this Dr. Baumgarten has effectively supplied. But alas, when it comes to us from America in an English dress, it comes in a form which robs it

of half its usefulness. The translator's name is not given, and the publisher is practically unknown to us. The intentions of both one and the other are no doubt admirable, but the result is a deplorable travesty of English, calculated to rout the most intrepid reader. Let us quote a few specimens. Here, to begin with, on p. 23, is a sentence that might have been culled by Mark Twain for his chapter on the German language:

Quite an impression made upon Lea the mediæval stories of confessions to lay persons.

It can hardly be necessary to explain even for the benefit of readers who are unfamiliar with German inverted constructions, that this only means that stories of confession to laymen produced a great effect on Dr. Lea. On p. 86 we find a not less characteristic sentence.

After reading this considerably expressed and yet of its character so damnatory finding, I determined to make some tests from all parts of Hansen's volume.

No doubt these examples are exceptionally bad. The general run of the text is not so discouraging. But often enough it is most difficult to grasp the writer's meaning without reference to the original. For example what is one to make of this?

Catholic Theology has much to learn before it can boast of the acuteness of Lea's discernment.<sup>1</sup>

Or of this:

Although Lea makes sincere efforts to work up in an unobjectionable manner the entire casuistry of the foundations for Indulgences, &c.

Or again (p. 37) of this:

At any rate Lea's theological schooling is not thorough enough to allow the reader of invariably accepting his occasional constructions of Simony as satisfactorily proved.

Moreover, the use of individual words and phrases is just as extravagant and un-English. Here are a few examples:

Lea's argument is like . . . the violent harangue of an attorney at court who by vituperous abuse seeks to offset the weakness of his evidence (p. 46). . . . The chapter about *solicitatio ad turpia* ails of the fundamental evil that all denunciations are equally valued (p. 102) . . . the aggrieving part is found in these grotesque words (p. 116) . . .

<sup>1</sup> A reference to the original shows that this only means "before it can boast such astuteness as Dr. Lea attributes to it."

a depiction of the character of the French King (p. 73) . . . the most serious oversight happens to Lea when he quotes Johannes of Fribourg (p. 33) . . . the sharp definition of Church doctrine is not what Lea is after (p. 23), &c., &c.

Dr. Baumgarten's excellent and scholarly work is really a great deal too good to be guyed in this way. Though the volume has not been sent us for review, we do not, by this "of its character so damnatory finding," wish to give unnecessary pain to the unknown translator. Still, we esteem it a public duty to protest against the stumbling-blocks put in the way of honest inquirers by so slipshod a travesty of a highly-deserving book.

H. T.

### *Reviews.*

#### I.—ESSAYS ON KNOWLEDGE.<sup>1</sup>

M. FONSEGRIVE in these *Essais sur la Connaissance* brings together four papers, of which the first three had appeared separately at different dates within the last seventeen years, and the last, which is also the longest, has been written expressly for this volume. They all bear on the same subject, the nature, limits, and value of the knowledge, scientific and metaphysical, we can acquire by the use of our cognitive faculties. An idea of the conclusions the author seeks to establish may be gathered from his reference in the short Preface to certain of his previous words which gave rise to much criticism. "The world," he wrote two years ago, "has since Descartes been in labour over the birth of a certain philosophy. The notion of science and the notion even of truth itself are undergoing revision, and there is no prospect of agreement in regard to them." M. Fonsegrive's present object is to explain and justify what he meant by this sentence. Of the four essays the first and third are directly on Kantianism, the second contrasts the modern opinions concerning the nature of Generalization and Induction with that of the Scholastics, the fourth is entitled *Certitude et Vérité*, and inquires into the conditions of legitimate certitude and its relation to objective truth.

<sup>1</sup> *Essais sur la Connaissance.* Par George Fonsegrive. Paris: Gabalda et Cie. Pp. iv. 268. Price, 3.50 fr. 1909.

M. Fonsegrive is an acute thinker, and his readers will be grateful to him for many searching criticisms of Kantianism, Pragmatism, and other current theories. He has also made a study of Scholasticism, and on several points prefers its expositions to those advocated by their modern opponents. Thus in his exposition of the nature of Generalization and Induction he leans towards the Scholastic doctrine, though dissenting from it in one very important respect. On the other hand, though he has evidently tried to understand the Scholastic writers, he is by no means always successful in grasping their meaning. Thus he quite misses the reason which led them to posit an *intellectus agens*, and in consequence misconceives its character. His account of their theory is that the sense-impressions determine the intellect as a purely recipient faculty (*intellectus possibilis*); and that this, according to the principle *quod recipitur secundum modum recipientis recipitur*, transforms the sense-impression into a thought-impression. Then the intellect as an active power (*intellectus agens*), reflecting on the thought-impression and discerning its potential universality, transforms it into a concept. Needless to say this as an exposition of their doctrine is altogether wrong. What they have in view is that sense-impressions cannot act so as to determine a spiritual faculty. It would be like trying to write on water. But sense and intellect being rooted in the same subject or person, the sense-impression when received in its own organ arouses the person and leads him to apply his *intellectus agens*, which then, like an artist with his model before him, discerns its own object in the sense-impression, and impresses on the *intellectus possibilis* an intellectual copy of it, to which is given the name of *species impressa*, or thought-impression. The reaction of the *intellectus possibilis* to this *species impressa* is the *species expressa*, or concept, in which consists the cognitive act.

But it is in the essay on Certitude and Truth that M. Fonsegrive travels farthest from Scholasticism and its foundation in "common sense." Here, in common with most moderns, he contends that "the question of knowledge, instead of being first and foremost the question of truth, is primarily the question of certitude, and, far from subordinating the definition of knowledge to any kind of definition of truth, we must subordinate even the definition of truth to our previous definition of certitude." To attempt the former, he says, would



involve the false assumption that we can have any conception of truth apart from the conception which our cognitive faculties have formed of it. It would be to act like one who declared a portrait to be true to the life of its original, although he knew of the original only through the portrait.

He starts then from the subject, "the only thing of which we have immediate knowledge," and, inasmuch as experience shows there are legitimate and erroneous certitudes, asks himself what are the notes by which the former is distinguishable from the latter. These he discovers to be four in number: (1) interior coherence, or the absence of any contradiction in the terms of the proposition—which, however, is a purely negative condition; (2) the necessary connection between the hypothetical *data* from which one starts and the conclusions at which under pain of absurdity one is forced to arrive through the intermediation of clear and distinct ideas—in other words the logical necessity of deducing these or those conclusions from these or those hypothetical premisses; (3) the accord of the hypothetical premisses with experience which establishes that the possible is in these or those cases realized; (4) two forms of social confirmation, one by successful resistance to social dissent, the other by the attainment of social assent. Of these four conditions, the first must be satisfied by all certitudes if they are to be legitimate, the second dominates mathematical truths, and the third every other sort of truth, whilst all need the support of the fourth.

These then are, according to M. Fonsegrive, to be regarded as the conditions of legitimate certitude, inasmuch as when in their due grouping they impart their sanction to any certitude they exercise over us a sort of imperious sovereignty which we cannot resist without having to bear "the secret reproaches of reason." Still, they would seem to be open to the criticism that they only state in a somewhat cumbrous way what, more simply stated, is quite a commonplace in any ordinary treatise on logic; nor do they suffice for the purpose for which the author invokes them, namely, as furnishing criteria of legitimate certitudes—since in regard to each of them it is possible that the thinker or investigator may have made a misjudgment, to detect which a criterium of truth is necessary. Moreover, they do not dispense with but throughout imply what M. Fonsegrive rejects, namely, the Scholastic position that the ultimate criterion is always the evidence of the object itself. How, for instance, can social assent or the triumph over social dissent confirm a man

in his certitude, unless by setting before him evidence of the value of which he himself can judge?

After having laid down in this way conditions of legitimate certitude, the author raises the further question "On what grounds can we think that even our legitimate certitude—which, after all, is only a state of our mind—corresponds to a reality distinct from our mind?" Here the difficulty already referred to recurs. How can we tell if our mental concepts truly represent objects external to themselves when we can only know of those external objects through the concepts which represent them? To some extent he thinks we can solve this puzzle satisfactorily so far as it regards our knowledge of our own selves, for in this case we have the two terms, the concept and its object, both equally present to us. Of material things foreign to our own bodies, quite consistently with his presupposition, he thinks we cannot have any knowledge further than that they exist, and have qualities of being which correspond with but do not necessarily resemble the sense-impressions they cause in us. So far, however, as material things belong to the order of brute matter, he does not think this impossibility of passing from correspondence to resemblance is of much consequence. "It is of small consequence to me what an arm-chair may be in itself provided I know that I can sit on it and repose in it"—he should rather have said, "have the feeling of sitting on it, and getting repose therefrom"—and "we only ask the table-salt to give us regularly the impression of savour we expect from it." But when it is a question of those bodies other than our own which are the bodies of our fellow-men, he thinks another consideration comes in. "If they are simple subjective figures which I represent to myself, I have the right to act towards them according as I have the power, to set them aside, to upset them, or even to suppress them—all which appears to me to be immoral and foolish." Besides, he has in this case a far better correspondence which amounts to resemblance between himself and his fellow-men, since he can exchange thoughts and impressions with them, and find how entirely they agree with him. There is something in this no doubt; still, the difference would appear to be only one of degree, inasmuch as a man's knowledge of his fellows is ultimately as much dependent on sense-impressions as his knowledge of brute matter.

M. Fonsegrive next proceeds to claim that through the principle of causality we can attain to the knowledge of God—

of His existence and attributes. We will not follow him into this, save to note that he appears to us to fall into the same sort of inconsistency as in the case, just referred to, of our knowledge of our fellow-men. But our main criticism on this entire essay is that it illustrates, though M. Fonsegrive fails to see it, that the one way of avoiding the pit of subjectivism, which places the modern philosopher in such sharp antagonism with the irrepressible conceptions of common sense, is through the Scholastic doctrine that our faculties, sense included, have for their direct and primary object not the images impressed on them by unknown external causes, but the external objects themselves, which thereby make themselves known to the thinking subject—the images impressed being not “that which” is known but “that by which” something else is known. Is not this in accord with the most elementary experience? Who supposes that what we see with the eyes is the image on the retina, or something indefinable apart from which we infer that there is a green field before us? Who does not assume that it is the green field itself which we see? And it is the same, proportionately, for our other faculties, of sense or intellect.

One criticism of a different nature we cannot withhold. It is really an outrage on a reviewer's feelings to furnish him with a book of this sort, charged with a subtle, complex, and prolix argument, and yet absolutely innocent of any Index, or *précis* of contents, or italicized headlines, or anything beyond the short titles of four chapters which fill 268 pages.

## 2.—DICTIONNAIRE D'APOLOGÉTIQUE.<sup>1</sup>

It is just six months since we reviewed the first instalment of the new edition of Jaugey's *Dictionnaire d'Apologétique*, which the Abbé d'Alès is bringing out. Now the second instalment has reached us. It contains exactly the same number of pages as the previous portion, which means that it begins in the middle of one article and ends in the middle of another. As before, the articles are of unequal length, some being full treatises, others brief statements. That is as it should be, for some subjects require more space than others; and on the whole the fasciculus has shown a due sense of proportion in its

<sup>1</sup> *Dictionnaire d'Apologétique de la Foi Catholique, contenant les preuves de la Vérité de la Religion et les Réponses aux Objections tirées des Sciences humaines. Quatrième édition entièrement refondue, sous la direction de A. d'Alès. Fasc. 2. Aumône—Concordats. Paris: Beauchesne. Price, 5 fr. 1909.*

allotments of space to the different subjects; much more so in fact than was the case in the previous fasciculus. Still, it would have been better to see such subjects as *La Saint-Barthélemy* and *Coligny* dealt with more exhaustively. They are indeed both well done, but one would have liked to be furnished not merely with correct narratives, but with convincing proofs that they are correct narratives, of a series of events with the responsibility for which the Church has been so unjustly charged. Of the longer articles the most important are *Babylone et la Bible*, by Père Condamin, *Criminalité du Clergé*, by the Abbé Bertrin, *Chine*, in three parts, by Père Wieger, *Canon Catholique des Saintes Écritures*, by the Abbé Mangenot, *Certitude*, by the Abbé Gény, *Catacombes*, by M. Allard, *Baptême des Hérétiques*, by the editor himself, *Cérébrologie*, by Dr. G. Surbled, *Conciles*, by Chanoine Forget. Père Condamin's article is particularly valuable. It is not so long ago since Rationalistic Criticism had it all its own way in discrediting the Old Testament narrative on the sole ground of internal evidence, and confidently setting up counter-theories to explain it. Now the innumerable finds in Babylonia and Egypt, particularly in the former, are gradually but surely amassing a kind of external evidence with the aid of which we can check the conclusions of the critics. These finds do not as yet touch more than the fringe of the Bible story, and they often create for us new difficulties. Still, they bring this story into relation with undoubted contemporary history, and cast light on the former more in harmony with its accounts than with the rationalistic theories. Indeed, P. Condamin can quote Mr. McCurdy for a remark that the time is passed when one searched among the monuments for the means of confirming the Bible account; and the time come when they serve to elucidate it. In the article before us the author, after commenting on the prevailing tendency to find traces of similarity and interdependence when they do not exist, compares the Biblical narrative step by step—from its accounts of Creation, the Fall, the Deluge, the Patriarchs, down to the acts of the Kings—with the corresponding testimonies brought to light by the Assyriologists. Why, by-the-by, does he pass over entirely the questions of Balthasar and Darius the Mede? The tripartite article on China is likewise of great value, for its author, Père Wieger, is one who has used his opportunities as a Jesuit missionary at Tien-tsin to make a thoroughly scientific study of the

country of his adoption. M. Bertrin's article is a convincing demonstration, drawn from the evidence of statistics, of the baselessness of the charges against clerical morality which the anti-clerical press are ever circulating. Very significant in this connection is the action of the French Government in 1885, to which the author calls attention. The statistics of criminality relating to the secularist school-teachers from that date go down suddenly from an average of 23 or so, to an average of 13 or so. M. Bertrin shows how this illusory evidence of improvement has been contrived. His article is, however, unnecessarily diffuse. The article on *Cérébrologie* is excellent, but it is one of those we should like to have had conceived on an ampler scale. It should, moreover, have been illustrated by diagrams. As there is an article on *Confucianism*, it is a little disappointing not to have articles on Brahmanism and Buddhism. Perhaps they will come under *Inde*, as *Confucianisme* does under China; still, in that case, should there not have been cross-references to *Inde*? An omission more difficult to explain is that of an article on the Celibacy of the Clergy, or, indeed, of one on the Clergy in themselves. There are many points in connection with the office and functions of the clergy which are subject to attack in the present age, and it would have been useful to have a solid vindication of the clerical state. This reminds one that there was an article on *Clergé* in the original Jaughey, which indeed was more bountiful in its headings. It was a question of choice. Jaughey himself gave shorter articles on a great number of interesting points of apologetic. His reviser gives far fewer articles, but these are longer and more profound. We have noted only one article, M. Allard's, taken over from the old edition into the new.

### 3.—THE DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT.<sup>1</sup>

The Old Testament, as interpreted by the Jews themselves, did not, so far as our extant records go, convey to the minds of its possessors a clear notion of the Suffering Messiah, though the passage, Isaiah liii., of itself and for us, is very forcible. In St. Justin's *Dialogue* Trypho recognizes the character: so also do some Rabbinical notices, about whose date a question may be raised. Often the stress of controversy compels attention to what had been previously overlooked; and it may well be that

<sup>1</sup> By J. Rivière, D.D., Professor of the Theological Seminary at Albi. The International Catholic Library, vol. xii. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, and Co. 2 vols. Pp. xiv, 323, 271. Price, 7s. 6d. each. 1909.

Christian polemics opened the eyes of the Jews to some passages in their own Scriptures.

In the New Testament the Gospels, when not deprived by adverse critics of such passages as tell most in favour of the doctrine of atonement, for instance Matt. xx. 28, Mark x. 45, are explicit enough: but it is to St. Paul, especially if the Epistle to the Hebrews is put among his letters, that the development of the theory is attributed, sometimes to the extent of making him even its originator. Auguste Sabatier, while allowing St. Paul's insistence upon Christ's Death for us, denies, what others maintain, that in him is to be found the dogma of satisfaction made to an angry God, whose anger, however, was consistent with the love that sent the Redeemer.

As Patristic literature developed, the doctrine of Redemption was more and more evolved, without entering into the deeper analysis instituted by the Scholastics. Against the Greek Fathers it is often urged that their insistence was simply upon the Incarnation as restoring immortality to our race, while they made comparatively little of the Death on the Cross as a means of satisfaction for sin. The facts of the case may be characteristically studied in the great doctor of the Incarnation, St. Cyril of Alexandria.

It was quite fit that the Word should put on a body to restore everlasting life to our body. Straw is by nature combustible: keep away the fire from it and it will not burn. But straw it remains, and as such it fears fuel which is ever able to consume it. But surround it with asbestos and then it is safe. Thus it is with the body and with death. Had death been destroyed merely by the act of the divine will, the body would have remained mortal and corruptible, according to the nature of all bodies. To prevent this the bodiless Word of God put on a body, and thus the body no longer fears death on account of the sheath of life which surrounds it.<sup>1</sup>

If we limited ourselves to passages like the above, we might regret that the life of the body seems put before the life of the soul which is bound up with it at the Resurrection; and that the Incarnation should be mentioned as the restorative of life rather than the Crucifixion. But we must not unduly stop short. Going forward we read:

The Word took a body in order to die for all. He therefore offered His body to death as a most pure victim. He paid the debt due to death and God's rights were secured. But at the same time He restored to men, to whom He had likened Himself by taking their nature, the privileges of immortality.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Orat.* ii. 14, vol. i. p. 170.

<sup>2</sup> Vol. i. p. 171.



This immortality is described by St. Athanasius as not merely of the body but also and especially as of the soul, as the life of grace ; he has chosen to dwell more upon our restored life than upon its means, the expiation of the Cross. Yet he teaches the latter as an article of faith.

The Reformation had largely for its effect to minimize the power of the Church in order to magnify the work of Christ. It spoke in strained language of the fury of the Father let loose upon the Son and of salvation as due to Christ alone, whose merits the sinner must lay hold of, not by works but by faith. What is called the juristic idea of redemption, divorced from the ethical, as if in anticipation of Kant's "dualism," was carried to such an extent that some reformers insisted simply on an amount of vindictive punishment to be paid, and declared that Christ suffered the *pœna damni*, the torment of Hell as our Substitute, leaving us necessarily captive to sins which are not imputed to us because He has paid our ransom from penalty.

It is true that some Catholic orators of the period spoke in a style that would not suit our age, even though we know that at the back of the bold imagery there is not the Protestant error about vicarious justification. It should be observed too that there is some explanation of the strained terminology to be found in Scripture itself. Thus the strength of the oratorical language used by Bossuet and Bourdaloue concerning the anger of God against Christ, and the vengeance taken upon our Saviour may be referred to passages of the Old Testament according to which Christ was for us "made sin"<sup>1</sup> and "made a curse,"<sup>2</sup> so that in the end He cried out as if "forsaken" by His Father. The energy of speech here is certainly very great, and we cannot wonder that some interpreters have attributed to it a sense inconsistent with the Personality of the Sufferer who in His own regard "knew not sin"<sup>3</sup> and was always infinitely precious in the sight of His Father.<sup>4</sup>

Round the idea of a deceit practised upon Satan and of a ransom paid to him there was gathered in early times a great deal of pictorial language of which rationalism has made the worst. St. Anselm opposed a strong front to this tendency, and with less correctness of language Abelard supported the attack. Before them, however, the Fathers had supplied an abundant antidote to their own looser phraseology : they certainly taught that Satan could never have made Christ his debtor, and that the satisfaction offered by Christ was essentially directed to the

<sup>1</sup> 2 Cor. v. 21.<sup>2</sup> Galat. iii. 13.<sup>3</sup> 2 Cor. v. 21.<sup>4</sup> Eph. v. 2.



offended God—a God so offended that His love for mankind was never lost, and was the cause why He provided a means of restoration to favour. The bugbear of a deep contradiction in God between His mercy and His justice is a pure fiction, and was not implied in Catholic theology, as its critics imagine.

Dr. Rivière's work is comprehensively and carefully done, so as to form a valuable part of the theological series to which it belongs. In having to interpret so many passages which were not originally written to mark off the precise doctrines which he wishes to discriminate in view of later controversies, it is impossible that he should always be free from attack on the side of those who put a different construction upon words and phrases. Thus the "mystery" mentioned, Romans xvi. 25, may be assigned to the Redemption, on the suggestion of Ephesians ii. 9, or it may be referred to a mysterious providence in the breaking down of the separation-wall between Jew and Gentile, on the suggestion of Romans xi. 25. As the author says, he depends for his exegesis of St. Paul not so much upon exact terminology as upon the whole trend of the Apostle's teaching. So also he must act in regard to the many other writers whose evidence he wishes to weigh, and may expect to find even his co-religionists occasionally differing from his opinion in the reading of passages open to minor variations in the construction put upon their terms.

---

#### 4—ROMAN CATHOLIC CLAIMS.<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Gore's *Roman Catholic Claims* has entered upon a second sixpenny edition. This is evidence of its popularity, a popularity which is not surprising, as it was written to deter hesitating Anglicans from becoming Catholics, and there are large numbers in the country who sympathize with this object. The book has already received Catholic answers from Dr. Rivington, Dom Chapman, and others, and it would be enough merely to announce this its latest edition were it not that it deserves to be considered in connection with the movement for reunion which the Guild of St. Thomas of Canterbury is so zealously promoting. That movement originated in the growing conviction among a group of earnest Anglicans that the divisions of Christendom are a scandal which all religious-minded persons should take seriously to heart, and to the

<sup>1</sup> By Charles Gore, D.D., D.C.L., "Bishop of Birmingham." New Edition. London: Longmans, Green and Co. Price, 6d. net. 1909.

extent of their power should strive to heal. To heal these divisions is indeed no easy task, but it would certainly tend to their healing if Anglicans and Catholics, instead of interchanging bitter recriminations, were to aim at cultivating only friendly relations; if they were to strive to understand, not to misunderstand one another; and to convert their controversies into calm discussions, in which each side sought in its turn, whilst not hesitating to set forth the full force of its own arguments, to do full justice to the arguments advanced by the other side. The Guild, in its endeavour to realize this ideal, has for some years back held annual meetings, in which the principal subjects that divide the two communions have been successively discussed. On each occasion the Guild has invited some one on the "Roman" side to state its case and its arguments as clearly as possible, and the reading of the papers has been followed by discussion. What has been particularly remarkable in these meetings has been the tone of perfect cordiality, or rather of mutual sympathy, which has animated all who took part in them. Invariably there has been a transparent solicitude to avoid all harsh constructions and all controversial tricks, to avoid also all attempts to extort admissions from upholders of the opposite view. The one endeavour has been to state what the writers or speakers on either side held to be the truth, with their reasons for so thinking, without presuming to intrude on that sacred domain where each man must work out his personal conclusions before the tribunal of his own conscience, and under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

Now, whatever may be thought of the arguments by which Bishop Gore, in his *Roman Catholic Claims*, seeks to prove his conclusions, there is one striking feature in this book which, to those who are like-minded with the Guild of St. Thomas, cannot fail to be inexpressibly painful. Newman, Manning, Brownlow, Rivington, and others innumerable of whom these are but types, have given serious and anxious study to the arguments, theological, exegetical, and historical, which Bishop Gore rejects. They have held a reputation among their fellows for sincerity and candour, and have not shrunk from the heaviest sacrifices in pursuing the path to which their researches seemed to them to point. Yet, Bishop Gore appears incapable of crediting them with any save the most corrupt motives and dishonourable methods. Let the following stand as a supreme instance of this un-Christian style of controversy.

After having dismissed St. Leo the Great as "wonderfully

unscrupulous in asserting the claims of his See, and strangely blinded in conscience to the authority of truth," he goes on to tell his readers that

Even *conscious* fraud is a familiar element in the official acts of the Roman See. And further, the love of interpolations and falsifications is alive still among Roman controversialists. The interpolations in St. Cyprian are still printed as an integral part of the text by Father Hurter, and quoted by Allnatt; and perhaps there is nothing which gives to the minds of intelligent and truth-loving men so invincible a prejudice against the Ultramontane system and temper—nothing which so radically convinces them that it is not Divine—as this certainty that Ultramontane writers will always be found manipulating facts and making out a case, will never behave as men who are loyally endeavouring to seek the light and present facts as they are.

This is surely unaccountable language for one in Bishop Gore's position, and it might have appeared still more unaccountable had he allowed his readers to judge for themselves of the real way in which the Ultramontane writers present their facts. But since Bishop Gore first framed this indictment critical research has put a new complexion on one point in it, the "interpolations" in St. Cyprian. It has long since been known that these "interpolations" were at least as early as the time of Pelagius II., the immediate predecessor of St. Gregory the Great, but Dom Chapman has recently shown it to be highly likely that the interpolator was St. Cyprian himself in a revision of his own work. The Bishop may not accept this view, but at least it has commended itself to a scholar like Harnack, and that being so one might have expected in this new edition a withdrawal of the charge of dishonesty at least in this particular instance, with a handsome apology for having made it. Yet what do we find? In the latest edition, which is now before us, the paragraph above transcribed is varied as follows:

Nay even *conscious* fraud is a familiar element in official acts of the Roman See. "At the last moment," writes Lord Acton, of the Vatican Council, "a tract appeared which has been universally attributed to Döllinger, which examined the evidence relied on by the infallibilists, and stated briefly the case against them. It pointed to the inference that their theory is not merely founded on an illogical and uncritical habit, but on unremitting dishonesty in the use of texts. This was coming near the secret of the whole controversy. . . ." There is indeed nothing which gives to the minds of the truth-loving men, &c.

Just as if *Janus* were a work of recognized honesty which could well bear the test of comparison with the authorities it cites!

One could wish that Bishop Gore would himself reflect on the impropriety of this mode of controversy; for could he be induced to do so he could not fail to perceive how injurious it must needs be to the cause of truth and of that Christian charity which is the best handmaid of truth. But in any case we are confident that the real workers for reunion in the Anglican communion will say of his book, its numerous editions and great popularity notwithstanding, *non tali auxilio nec defensoribus istis*.

---

### 5.—MARY.<sup>1</sup>

In her new story entitled *Mary*, Miss Winifred Graham makes a bold venture, and must expect some severe criticisms. Or perhaps we should rather say, she has chosen a subject which only an extreme delicacy of treatment could render tolerable, and yet has not been able to avoid striking some false notes. Still, she has had a good purpose in view—apart from one feature in it on which we shall comment presently—and on the whole, though no one would call her book convincing, has not achieved it so badly. Her idea, if we rightly divine it, is to illustrate what would be the likely effect on the life of some small village circle, with all its misunderstandings and shortcomings, if a perfect Christian character were to intervene in it as one of its residents; and she chooses to bring in in this way no less a personage than our Blessed Lady. An artist parts with a much-valued gardener who is the victim of a calumnious charge. A friend recommends a lady gardener, whose skill and the sweetness of whose disposition captivate all who come in contact with her. She is named Mary Aquila, but that is all that is known about her. To work out such a theme involves that the story should partake of the style of a fairy tale, and so it does. The artist, on the morning of her arrival, sees her for the first time in the conservatory.

He opened the door of the conservatory where the purple passion-flowers made their home, and, as he did so, a gentle figure, gowned simply in a robe of deep rich blue, turned to him and smiled good morning. Just for a moment Arrow spoke no word. Mary's beauty was so spirituelle that it took away his breath and held him dumb with overpowering admiration. He experienced the startled sensation he

<sup>1</sup> By Winifred Graham. London: Mills and Boon, Ltd. Pp. 377. Price, 6s. 1909.

would have expected to feel in the presence of an unearthly visitant suddenly materializing before the wondering gaze of mortal eyes. . . . For a moment he could not speak, only he noticed that the passion-flowers which slumbered yesterday were well awake this morning. Full open leaves bloomed around Mary in purple profusion, as if her presence endowed them with mysterious strength; even the weakly plants gave forth an offering of prodigal blossom.

This influence over plants is represented as the counterpart to a similar influence over men and women, who quickly recognize her charm, and burst forth into their best bloom. Hard characters become softened, vulgar characters refined, sinful characters are reformed, and wrongs, quarrels, and scandals melt away—as if in response to an outburst of spiritual sunshine—as soon as this mysterious being enters into their lives.

The authoress, in spite of the few notes that jar, shows so much Catholic feeling in her treatment of her subject that, till we came to one particular passage, we took her to be a Catholic writer, trained in the Catholic art of living in communion with Jesus and Mary after the pattern of the life of Nazareth. Hence the passage in question came as a shock.

"I do not like the Gabriel bell."

The reply fell like lead on [Arrow's] ear.

Here was a woman with the face of a Madonna, here was "Mary," the namesake of the Virgin Mother, actually saying in her calm, clear tones, "I do not like the Gabriel bell."

"The Angelus," she said, "has always been rung by man to venerate the one woman who would most keenly have desired to escape veneration. The Virgin Mary wanted no prominence in her life, she sought no praise, but dwelt in humble retirement, only looking from afar at the greatness of her Lord. The very thought of being held up as an object of worship would have tormented her quiet retiring spirit, possibly even disturbing (if such things could be), her eternal rest."

And so on, with much worse to follow. Catholic readers will be prone to resent this intrusion of Protestant mentality, so out of keeping with all that has preceded—for does not the authoress perceive that, if such were the feeling of our Blessed Lady in Heaven, it would be equally tormenting to her to be depicted as she is depicted in this book? Still, we prefer to regard the authoress as one who has been able only partially to rise out of the prejudices in which she has been brought up. Let her reflect, then, that no address could be more exalting

to Mary than that of the Angel which the Gabriel bell commemorates, and let her reflect that "humility is truth;" and that for one who was so true and faithful as the Virgin Mother, it cannot be difficult to accept that homage which is only the homage of truth, and at the same time to refer it all to the source to which she owed everything.

### Short Notices.

THE usual C.T.S. budget is not to be appraised by the mere size and cost of its contents. It contains some publications of no small value for scholarship. The five following penny pamphlets belong to the *History of Religions* series. Père A. Condamin, S.J., in **The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria** writes on an important subject on which he can speak with authority. Whilst relating in outline what is known of the religion of the two countries, he warns us that, even though the small published fraction of Babylonian literature is already incomparably greater than the whole of Hebrew literature, our knowledge of Assyrio-Babylonian religion is still incomplete and provisional. At the end of his brief *résumé* of the points of contact, he concludes that the history of Israel has been remarkably confirmed by the discoveries of Assyriology. On p. 27, l. 19, should not "movements" be "monuments"?

**Ancient King-Worship** is illustrated by Father C. Lattey, S.J., chiefly from Greek and Roman sources. He brings out very cogently the fact that one of the chief reasons why Christians were persecuted was because of their "incivism," or refusal to worship the God-Cæsar. The spirit of Cæsar-worship is not dead yet, and this very interesting essay closes with words of warning that appeared some time ago in the *Etudes*.

**St. Augustine**, by Mr. C. Martindale, S.J., is an admirable essay, full of illuminating criticism and a marvel of concentration. Any one who desires to undertake a serious study of the life and works of the great Bishop-Saint of Hippo will find in this little pamphlet more real help than is afforded by many more pretentious volumes. In his last paragraph Mr. Martindale packs into thirteen lines of nervous prose a summary of the life-work and permanent influence of St. Augustine.

Dr. Adrian Fortescue, in his **Gregory VII.**, gives us in a short sketch the strenuous life of Hildebrand. We read how he was nurtured in the Lateran palace, came under the influence of Cluny, was the counsellor of Popes, and finally in 1073 became Pope himself under the title of Gregory VII. His life was one long struggle against simony and lay-investiture, and insistence on the celibacy of the clergy. We are told of the struggle with the Emperor Henry IV., of the dramatic coming to Canossa, and of Gregory's death at Salerno with the words: "I have loved justice and hated iniquity, therefore I die in exile." Iniquity triumphed for the moment, but in the end justice prevailed.

In **Eastern Churches** Dr. Fortescue is at a disadvantage in having to treat of such a vast and varied theme within the brief compass of thirty-two pages. Yet he has succeeded admirably in giving the broad outlines of the genesis, history, and present status of the various Eastern communions. A

reader cannot help being struck by the evidences given of the missionary activity of the Nestorians in the hey-day of their power and influence.

**My Catholic Socialist, a Dialogue** (C.T.S., 1d.), by Mr. R. P. Garrold, S.J., written in a bright, breezy style, is a distinct contribution to the literature of the subject. Very clever is the author's parable of the Pope as hakim, or physician, to Dame Europa; but perhaps it is too much to hope that it will induce more than a few Socialists to climb "the Hill and Asperous way that leadeth into the House of Sanity."

**What the Soldier Said** (C.T.S., 1d.), is a new edition of one of Mr. James Britten's best tracts. In his vigorous and trenchant style, he collects various instances where Protestant bigots have taken what proves to be the vaguest hearsay (like "the account of what he said as stated by Mr. Samuel Smith's friend's late husband's minister's informant") as convincing evidence against the Church of Rome. Sad to say, when shown to be in error, these adversaries regularly refuse to retract or make any apology.

The history of **Lady Wimborne's donkey**, though a little ancient, is still refreshing.

**Evolutionary Problems** (C.T.S., 1d.), by Father Gerard, contains two essays, "Man and Monkey," and "Some of Nature's Whims." The former is chiefly concerned with the exposure of Professor Haeckel's unscrupulous methods. In the latter, Father Gerard enumerates various extraordinary manifestations of instinct, and suggests that it is wiser, instead of seeking to explain the inexplicable, to acknowledge that, "Scientifically considered, nature is a riddle to which human curiosity can find no answer."

**The Line of Cleavage under Elizabeth** (C.T.S., 3d.) embodies a paper read by Dom Norbert Birt, O.S.B., before the Society of St. Thomas of Canterbury. It deals with Elizabeth's *Act of Supremacy*, the *Act of Uniformity*, and all the parliamentary legislation that set at nought the jurisdiction of the Pope and declared illegal the Mass and Catholic priesthood.

It was a happy idea on the part of Father E. Buckland, S.J., to translate into English the letter of St. Alphonsus Liguori **On Retreats** (Sands, 2d. net.). The little work may be read with profit by any one, especially during a retreat. As it may be used by simple folk, would it not be better to render into English every word of the original Latin?

**Meditationum et Contemplationum Puncta** (Herder, 4.25 fr., 1909), by Father von Hummelauer, S.J., reaches us in its second edition. The work is in Latin, and thus appeals mainly to the clergy. For those who have not yet made acquaintance with this little volume, we may say that Father von Hummelauer follows the text of his Founder's Spiritual Exercises most faithfully, and excels in making clear the logical connection between the various meditations.

**A Private Retreat for Religious** (Benziger, 6s. net, 1909), by Father Peter Geiermann, C.S.S.R., is in English, and is founded on the spiritual writings of St. Alphonsus. Novelty is sometimes a help in retreat, and the work in question contains several novel features; for instance, some simple verses at the end of each day's points.

To the busy parish priest, who has not much spare time, a sane and well-ordered commentary on the Catechism is always welcome. We venture to think that a real want is supplied by the Sisters of Notre Dame in publishing I. and II. of their **Doctrinal Explanations** in a single pamphlet (Washbourne, 3d.).

**The Chronicle of Thomas of Eccleston**, translated by Father Cuthbert, O.S.F.C. (Sands 2s. 6d. net.), gives the early history of the Friars Minor



in England. We live in an age of luxury and self-seeking, and to read of the poverty and simplicity of these early friars is an excellent spiritual tonic. Very charming and naïve is Brother Thomas's account of the single-minded men who did such a wonderful social work in our land; fostered by the rich, but ever the champions of the poor and the oppressed.

We fail to see how **The World's Madonna**, by J. S. Mulholland (Burns and Oates, 2s. 6d. net) justifies its sub-title *A History of the Blessed Virgin Mary*. These essays are written by a very fervent Catholic, and in reading them one may acquire a considerable amount of information on many topics besides the history of our Lady.

**The Raccolta** (Burns and Oates, 5s. net, 1909). In his Preface (dated November 2, 1908), the editor of this, the sixth edition of Father Ambrose St. John's version of the *Raccolta*, says that it has been conformed to the latest Roman *Raccolta*, approved July 23, 1898, and the Supplement, approved July 31, 1902; and contains also the Indulgences and decisions since recorded in the *Acta Sanctae Sedis* up to the present time. It thus forms a useful handbook for the clergy and devout laity.

The fifth Report of **The Catholic Record Society**, gives a highly encouraging account of the work done, work in progress, and work contemplated by this young but vigorous Society. The volume for the fifth year (1908—9), shortly to be issued, contains as its principal item the *Bedingfeld Papers*, which promise to be of exceptional interest.

The Report of the **Catholic Education Council** for the year 1908 is to hand. It is much to be wished that more Catholics would make a study of this annual publication. The work of the Catholic Education Council, though carried on very silently, is of immense importance for the protection and maintenance of our school system, but it is sadly in need of more funds. In future it will miss Lord Ripon's generous subscription of £100 per annum. That may be hard to supply. But the small sums put in the plate on Collection Sunday could easily be doubled without the contributors feeling the difference; yet the difference in the general total would be considerable.

In **Rose Kavanagh and her Verses** (Gill, Dublin), edited by Father Matthew Russell, we have a dainty little memorial of a singer whose songs are not the less beautiful because their range is limited and their number few. Over Miss Kavanagh's life of thirty-two years the shadow of consumption speedily fell, and her personality, as her writings, owed something of their pathetic attraction to the consciousness of an early and inevitable doom. To the poet's keen eye for the beauty and significance of physical nature she added a patriot's love for her native land, and both qualities are prominent in her tuneful verses. She seems to have possessed considerable powers of self-criticism, often denied to more copious writers, and all her productions are marked by an artistic finish and restraint. The Editor has performed his task with the sympathetic interest and literary skill associated with his name. We have first a brief memoir entitled *Herself*, then a collection of elegies, called *Her Memory*, which her sweet character and early death called forth from several of her friends, and finally *Her Verses*, some score of pieces chiefly lyrical and descriptive, which make real if slender contribution to literature. We venture to think that the interest of the little volume would have been increased if it had been found possible to give a representation of what Miss Tynan calls "the most honest face in the world with brave grey eyes and a country brownness over the clear tints, as if it loved the sun and the breezes." By thus viewing together her physical and spiritual lineaments we should have a still better idea of a charming personality than is given us by this charming book.

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

*Albrighi, Segati, and Co. (Società Editrice Dante Alighieri), Roma—Milano:*

STORIA DELLA COMPAGNIE DI GESU IN ITALIA, NARRATA COL SUSSIDIO DI FONTE INEDITE: By Padre Pietro Tacchi Venturi, S.J. Vol. I. La vita religiosa in Italia durante la prima età del Ordine. Col Appendice di documinti inediti. Pp. xi, 720. Price, 15 lire. 1910.

*Thomas Baker, London:*

A SPIRITUAL CANTICLE OF THE SOUL AND THE BRIDEGROOM CHRIST: By St. John of the Cross. Translated by David Lewis, with corrections and Introduction by Benedict Zimmerman, O.C.D. Pp. xxiv, 317. Price, 6s. 6d. net. 1909.

*Burns and Oates, Ltd., London:*

THE WORLD'S MADONNA, A HISTORY OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY. By J. Shaw Mulholland, B.L. Pp. 232. Price, 2s. 6d. net. 1909.  
THE RACCOLTA: By Ambrose St. John, of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri. Sixth Edition. Pp. xv, 428. Price, 5s. net. 1909.

*Mills and Boon, London:*

MARY: By Winifred Graham. Pp. 377. Price, 6s. 1909.

*Constable, London:*

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL ORIGIN AND THE NATURE OF RELIGION: By J. H. Leuba. Pp. 95. Price, 1s. 1909. SCHOPENHAUER: By T. W. Whittaker. Pp. 94. Price, 1s. net. 1909.

*C.T.S., London:*

THE LINE OF CLEAVAGE UNDER ELIZABETH. By Dom Norbert Birt, O.S.B. Price, 3d. 1909. Some Penny Pamphlets.

*Catholic Record Society, London:*

THE FIFTH REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS, July, 1909.

*Catholic Education Council, London:*

REPORT for the year 1908.

*Herder, Freiburg im Breisgau:*

MEDITATIONUM ET CONTEMPLATIONUM S. IGNATII DE LOYOLA PUNCTA. Explicavit Franciscus de Hummelauer, S.J. Editio altera recognita. Pp. x, 596. Price, 4.25 fr., bound, 5.25 fr. 1909.

*Sands and Co., London:*

ON RETREATS: By St. Alphonsus Liguori. Translated by E. H. Buckland, S.J. Pp. 23. Price, 2d. net. 1909.

*R. and T. Washbourne, Ltd., London:*

DOCTRINAL EXPLANATIONS. I. The Christian's Rule of Life and Daily Exercise. II. The Sacraments in General: By the Sisters of Notre Dame. Pp. 96. Price, 3d. 1909.

## SOME FOREIGN REVIEWS.

### *Summary of Contents.*

#### I.

#### **Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique** (1909). III.

- J. Mahé*.—Sanctification according to St. Cyril of Alexandria.  
*J. M. Vidal*.—A Collection of Sermons delivered at the Councils of Constance and Bâle.  
*R. Ancel*.—The Reconciliation of England by Cardinal Pole. Reviews, &c.

#### II.

#### **Bessarione**. (1909). II.

- A. Palmieri*.—Catholic and Orthodox views of doctrinal development.  
*F. Ballerini*.—The importance attached to Names in Ancient Egypt.  
*N. Marini*.—St. John Chrysostom's apparent failings.  
*A. Palmieri*.—Catholicism as depicted in the new Russian Theological Encyclopædia. Reviews, &c.

#### III.

#### **Revue Pratique d'Apologétique**. August 1 and 15.

- P. Dhorme*.—The Moral Law in the Assyrian Religion.  
*M. D'Herbigny*.—The Apologetical Arguments of St. Augustin.  
*J. Guibert*.—Latin in our Seminaries.  
*H. Lesêtre*.—The Assumption of our Lady.

#### IV.

#### **Der Katholik**. (1909). VIII.

- H. Bellesheim*.—The Canonizations of May 20, 1909.  
*F. Anders*.—Hugh of St. Victor, the author of the *Summa Sententiarum*.

*W. Schleussner*.—New Lights on the German Mystics.

*H. Schmidkunz*.—Religious Art.

#### V.

#### **Mélanges de la Faculté Orientale de Bayrouth**. (1909.)

- H. Lammens*.—The Arab Inscriptions of Mount Tabor.  
*R. Mousterde*.—Epigraphic Notes.  
*L. Cheikho*.—The "Hamâsa" of Bahturi.  
*I. Jalabert*.—Two American archaeological Missions in Syria.  
*S. Ronzevalle*.—Notes on Oriental archaeology.  
*P. Peeters*.—St. Barlaam of Mount Casius.

#### VI.

#### **Razón y Fe**. August.

- V. Minteguiaga*.—The Question of Dramatic Censorship in Spain.  
*M. Bover*.—The Apostolic Fathers and the Dogma of the Redemption.  
*Ugarte de Eraila*.—Spontaneous Generation.  
*R. Ruiz Amado*.—Spanish or Catholic?  
*Z. García*.—The Pardon of Sins in the Primitive Church.

#### VII.

#### **Stimmen aus Maria Laach**. (1909). VII.

- A. Baumgartner*.—Literature and the Catholic Church.  
*H. Pesch*.—Strikes and Lock-outs.  
*J. Bessmer*.—Telepathy.  
*S. Beissel*.—The History of Prayer-books.  
*V. Cathrein*.—Monistic Evolution and Ethics.

